



---

INTRODUCTION TO CHRISTIAN CAUCASIAN HISTORY The Formative Centuries (IVth–VIIIth)

Author(s): CYRIL TOUMANOFF

Reviewed work(s):

Source: *Traditio*, Vol. 15 (1959), pp. 1–106

Published by: [Fordham University](#)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/27830383>

Accessed: 08/02/2013 11:33

---

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at  
<http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



Fordham University is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Traditio*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

## INTRODUCTION TO CHRISTIAN CAUCASIAN HISTORY

### THE FORMATIVE CENTURIES (IV<sup>TH</sup>-VIII<sup>TH</sup>) \*

BY CYRIL TOUMANOFF

It is no doubt a commonplace to state that Western Civilization is an heir, one among several, of an anterior unity: Christian Mediterranean Civilization. In that earlier unity all the local cultures that had sprung up round the great central sea — Egyptian, Mesopotamian, Anatolian, Aegean, Syrian, Iranian, Hellenic, Italic — had coalesced in three successive and increasingly comprehensive phases within the corresponding imperial frameworks of the *pax achae-mentia*, the *pax macedonica*, and the *pax romana*. With the advent of Christianity this political and cultural amalgam passed into still another phase, that of the *pax christiana*, which fell heir also to the hitherto seclusive cultural tradition of the Jews. But, before this last phase was reached, the rhythm of history had changed from gathering to scattering; Iran, which once itself had contributed to the cultural syncretism of the Mediterranean world, and which can be regarded as that world's easternmost bastion, withdrew from it under the impact of the 'neo-Achaemenian' and anti-Hellenic reaction which inaugurated the Sassanian age. Iran was to remain hostile to the *pax romana* and, although Christian enclaves were to be established in its territory, outside the new unity of Christendom. But, even though withdrawn back to the pre-Hellenistic phase of history — as if Alexander the Great had never lived — New Iran exercised, chiefly through Syria, a profound influence, especially in art, upon the rest of the Mediterranean world, both before and after the ushering in of the *pax christiana*. With time, the disintegration begun

---

\* The following additional abbreviations are used here: AB = *Analecta Bollandiana*; CSHB = *Corpus scriptorum historiae byzantinae*; ST = *Studi e Testi*. — Classical variants of Caucasian proper names are given first throughout this work, their local equivalents second. In many cases, the former indeed make their recorded appearance earlier than the latter; by using them, moreover, the basic unity of Mediterranean Civilization is emphasized. Another reason for this — as well as for giving modern Latinized equivalents of some toponyms (Kakhetia, Ossetia, Siunia) that have no Classical variants, and also for translating whenever possible offices and titles — is that local color tends to be divisive and exoticism seldom serves to explain. When terms are cited, however, they are given in their own form: when in the plural, accompanied by the Armenian plural determinative *-k'* or the (ancient) Georgian plural determinative *-n*. Georgian terms when cited as terms are given in the absolute case, i.e., without the nominative determinative *-i* (*-y*). — I feel, finally, that I owe an apology for introducing neologisms, like 'dynasticism,' 'Iranianism,' 'monogenetic' and 'polygenetic sovereignty,' 'vitaxa,' etc., but they have the advantage of expressing precisely the intended meanings.

in Iran spread. Christian Mediterranean Civilization was broken up and succeeded by several others that derived from it: that of the West was one, that of Byzantium another, and so also that of Christian Caucasia.

The latter arose in an area of the Mediterranean world that is bounded in the north by the chain of the Caucasus, washed in the east by the Caspian and in the west by the Black Sea, opens out in the south, semi-circularly, towards Iran, Mesopotamia, Syria, and Asia Minor, and is perennially divided into two principal parts: Armenia and Georgia. The area is marked by a cultural and historical unity and individuality that distinguish it from these neighbouring areas, and from the history-less highlanders in the north. This unity and individuality can only be expressed by the term 'Caucasia.' 'Ciscaucasia,' were it less cumbersome, might be used for the sake of greater precision; while 'Transcaucasia,' in addition to being equally unwieldy, must be discarded as quite inadequate: it expresses the comparatively recent point of view of Russian imperial expansion and belies the historical development of the area, which, prior to the intensified Russian diplomatic offensive of the eighteenth century and the Russian annexations of the nineteenth, had practically nothing in common with the historical development of the regions lying north of the Caucasus.<sup>1</sup>

It is to the Mediterranean world that Caucasia belonged. Its earliest ethno-cultural beginnings were Anatolian and displayed, in addition, marked Mesopotamian and Aegean affinities; it participated successively in the Iranian, Hellenistic, Roman, and Christian phases through which that world passed; and its connexion with Byzantium remained intimate. Religiously, its contact with the Roman Empire of the East was decisive. The political history of the two great Caucasian nations is inseparable from that of the *partes Orientis*. In the domain of sociological factors, the contact with Byzantium was particularly close: here Caucasia contributed more than it received, as shown by the Caucasian origin of a great part of the ruling élite of the Empire, including the imperial houses of the Heraclids and the Basilids. Finally, Byzantine cultural influence was well-nigh preponderant in Caucasia. In a sense, one may speak of Armenia and Georgia as 'Byzantine.' If the adjective be taken in a very broad and comprehensive — unitive — sense, as denoting the culture

---

<sup>1</sup> The word 'Transcaucasia,' moreover, denotes an administrative unit of today that is considerably smaller than the territory of historical Caucasia, for a great part of Armenia and some sections of Georgia lie outside it. On the other hand, historical Armenia is often spoken of as a neighbor rather than part of Caucasia. The above does not, of course, imply that the regions north of the Caucasus and Caucasia were unknown to one another before the eighteenth century. Actually, e.g., the Khazar State and the Golden Horde played a certain role in Caucasian history; there were a number of dynastic and cultural contacts between medieval Georgia and medieval Russia, and the Georgian-Russian diplomatic relations can be traced back to the sixteenth century.

and especially the arts of the phase of the *pax christiana*, i.e. the 'style' which resulted from the meeting of the Romano-Hellenistic, Semitic, and neo-Iranian streams, then these countries, together with the rest of Christendom from Ireland to Ethiopia and from Spain to Osrhoene, may indeed be so called.<sup>2</sup> The adjective 'Byzantine,' however, has also a narrower sense, at once restrictive — divisive — and more manifold, designating, on the one hand, only a section of the Christian Mediterranean world, but, on the other hand, designating it in all the aspects of existence. This section was marked by the retention of its original cultural style while other sections, the West for instance, were to pass on to newer ones; and, above all, it was determined by the eastern survival of the Roman political forms. This section — Byzantium — was, moreover, subject to a process of contraction and retrogression: away from the pan-Mediterranean cultural and political unity of both the *pax romana* and the *pax christiana* back to an East-Mediterranean, Hellenistic unity, then to the shape of a Balkan-Aegean, national Greek State, and finally to the nucleal dimensions of a mere Greek city-state. In this sense 'Byzantine' does not apply to Caucasia.

In addition to being a part of the Mediterranean Christian world and to having its Byzantine connexions, Caucasia participated culturally, politically, and socially in the world of New Iran; and it shared to some extent in the religious life of Christian Mesopotamia, a political dependency of Iran, and of Christian Syria, a political dependency of Byzantium, but one steadily moving away from it. It was precisely the counterpoise between the cultural and political influences of Byzantium and of Iran that fostered the individuality and autonomy of Caucasia and ensured their survival. Of all the successors of the pan-Mediterranean unity, Caucasia was perhaps the most multiplex, for, besides what it possessed in common with the others, it also received of the heritage of Sassanian Iran.

Both the Roman Empire and Christendom were carriers of pan-Mediterranean Civilization, yet neither was entirely coextensive with the Mediterranean world. The Empire outspread it in Europe, but failed to reach its eastern limits; Christendom outspread it and the Empire in Asia, in Europe, and in Africa. The phase of the *pax christiana* was, however, one of a near-coextension of the above-named four elements; yet it contained the seeds of future

<sup>2</sup> See J. Baltrušaitis, *Études sur l'art médiéval en Géorgie et en Arménie* (Paris 1929) and Henri Focillon's Preface for the resemblances between Caucasian and Romanesque art: 'on peut les considérer l'un et l'autre comme deux expériences historiques sur le même problème, avec des données et dans des conditions analogues, mais conduites par des expérimentateurs différents' (viii). Caucasian architecture appears to display a certain inchoate tendency towards Gothic forms; A. U. Pope, 'Iranian and Armenian Contributions to the Beginnings of Gothic Architecture,' *Armenian Quarterly* 1/2 (1948).



disunion. It was during that phase that most of the Western half of the Empire was overrun by new peoples and escaped the control of the Constantinopolitan — East Mediterranean — successors of the Roman Emperors, and that the foundations of Western Civilization were laid, outspreading together with Christianity the original extent of the *partes Occidentis*. At the same time, the government at Constantinople was constrained to abandon its suzerain and protective rights over Christian Caucasia in favor of the then chief adversary of Christendom, the Sassanid empire. Meantime, in Iran itself, as well as in Turkestan, India and Ceylon, in Arabia, Ethiopia, and Nubia, Christian communities had arisen which were bound by no political ties with the Christian Empire. It was during this period also that the beginnings of the subsequent cultural differentiation between the various sections of Christendom began to manifest themselves: through the process of contraction and retrogression in Byzantium, and through the addition or revival of local ethnic elements elsewhere.

This temporal process left a profound impression on religious developments, and was in turn dependent on them. The centuries between the conversion of the Roman Empire and the rise of Islam saw not only the diminution of that polity and the break-up of the pan-Mediterranean cultural unity, but also the beginning of the division of Christendom itself. In these formative centuries, as they may well be called, the different attitudes of local Christian bodies towards the Universal Church were molded. The Mesopotamians and the Persians, the Syrians, the Egyptians and the Ethiopians, the Armenians and the Caucasian Albanians came to form separate national Churches of their own; the Byzantines developed the psychology of a regional Church, the effects of which reached their formal expression only later; and the Georgians, after some vacillation, held fast to the Byzantines. These religious developments were intimately connected with the growing centrifugal political attitudes of some of the East Mediterranean dependencies of the Empire.

On these pages, the words 'Catholic' and (in its religious sense) 'Universal' are used interchangeably. They denote the institution which the historian may describe as the supra-national and supra-political spiritual society which, for all its variety of ritual expression, is one in communion with and centred in the See of Peter. It was this institution that the first recorded user of the term 'the Catholic Church' had in mind.<sup>3</sup> Consequently, the expressions 'Catholic Faith' and 'Catholicism' designate that Church's system of faith. And while 'Monophysite,' 'Monophysitism,' 'Nestorian,' 'Nestorianism,'

---

<sup>3</sup> St. Ignatius of Antioch, *Smyrn.* 8.2, in conjunction with *Rom.* For a recent analysis of the second letter, cf. J. Quasten, *Patrology I* (Utrecht/Brussels 1950) 68-70; J. Lebreton, 'Les Pères Apostoliques et leur époque,' in A. Fliche and V. Martin, *Histoire de l'Église I* (Paris 1946) 331-334.

etc. are used here to describe other religious bodies and their systems of faith, the purely descriptive words 'orthodox,' 'orthodoxy,' 'heretic(al),' 'heresy' are avoided. During these formative centuries, the adherents of all the different systems of faith, and of all the different religious groups, applied to themselves the above commendatory terms and reserved their antonyms for those of divergent systems and bodies; and all the East Mediterranean regional Churches that have sprung up outside the Catholic unity have to this day claimed the epithet 'orthodox' as part of their designation. It is only fair, therefore, not to restrict, as is often done, this epithet exclusively to the Greek Orthodox, i.e., the adherents of Byzantine Christianity<sup>4</sup> as it became, outside the Catholic unity, at first a polity-determined communion and, then, a communion of nation-determined bodies.

The story of how the Armenians formed a national (Armenian Orthodox) Church, while the Georgians remained for several centuries longer within the unity of the Universal Church, prior to the crystallization, outside of it, of Imperial Byzantine (Greek Orthodox) Christianity to which they clung, has not been adequately dealt with. Several reasons having to do with both method and material account for this inadequacy. It has been seen that Christian Caucasasia was endowed with an individuality and a unity which made of it a world distinct from the related other fragments of pan-Mediterranean Civilization. It is impossible, therefore, to treat of but one part of Christian Caucasasia — either Armenia or Georgia — to the exclusion of the rest. And it is impossible, at the same time, to deal with Christian Caucasasia without regard to the closely related East Mediterranean (Byzantine, Iranian, Syro-Mesopotamian) context. This is equally true of religious and of political and social history. And yet, all this — owing partly to a projection to the past of subsequent confessional and nationalistic views and partly to narrow specialization — has been often overlooked in historical writings treating of both temporal and spiritual developments in the area. These developments, moreover, were interconnected and interdependent; accordingly, a framework of political and social history is indispensable for a correct appraisal of religious history. This framework, however, remains incomplete, and there are a number of obscure and uninvestigated spots in the history of Caucasasia during the formative centuries.

As for the Caucasian source material, it has suffered from both a mistaken evaluation and insufficient use. Thus, the traditional *floruit* of some of the great Armenian historians, Pseudo-Moses of Khoren, for instance, has only recently been challenged; some invaluable sources, like those contained in the *Book of Letters*, were published only at the beginning of this century and

---

<sup>4</sup> The adjective 'Byzantine' is used here in its restrictive and divisive sense.

have even to this day been neglected by some of the scholars dealing with Caucasian history; while other important sources, such as the Georgian Royal Annals or the *Narratio de rebus Armeniae*, came to be critically studied and appraised, thanks to the discovery of older and better manuscripts than those previously published, within the last few years. Moreover, it is only now that it has become possible to realize that some of the ancient Armenian historians who have always been known and highly respected were actually afflicted, in the service of national religion, with a tendency to overlook some facts of history and to alter others.

Thus it appears rather imperative to restate, on the basis of all the available material, the interrelated facts of the religious and political history of the Christian Caucasian world in the broader context of the East Mediterranean political and religious developments during the centuries that have been here described as formative. In these centuries, Caucasia was the apple of discord between Byzantium and Iran, and in this epic struggle the divergent solutions proposed by the Armenians and by the Georgians to the problem of their relations with the Catholic Church and the Roman Empire became crystallized. For such a restatement of facts the following is offered as an introduction.

Social history is possibly of even greater moment for an appreciation of the Caucasian religious development than political history; and without some knowledge of it, no understanding of political history is possible. It is at once a more fundamental and a more stable factor than the other; its roots must be traced farther back into the past. Hence in the first place we shall deal with Caucasian Society: its history and the political developments that affected it, by way of introduction to the temporal and spiritual developments of the formative centuries.

#### THE HISTORICAL BACKGROUND OF CAUCASIAN SOCIETY

1. The word 'Caucasia,' as used here, designates the cis-Caucasian, north-easternmost region of the Mediterranean world that is distinct from the adjacent lands of Anatolia, Syria, Mesopotamia, and Iran. This distinctness is first of all historical; but, geographically too, Caucasia can be regarded as a distinct unity. It is bounded by, precisely, the four neighbouring regions, by the Black and the Caspian Sea, and by the great chain of the Caucasus, which, stretching north-west to south-east across the isthmus between the two seas, provides for it, as for the rest of the Mediterranean world, a protective barrier against the hyperborean waste beyond. This is a well-nigh impenetrable wall, save for a few passes, like the Alan Gate, or Daryal defile, in the centre and the coastal ways at either end. There are two parts to this unity: the ellipse of the Armenian Plateau and, between the parallel ramparts of

its northern ridge, or Anti-Caucasus, and of the Caucasus itself, the nearly rhomboidal latitudinal depression of the southern section of the Caucasian, or Ponto-Caspian, Isthmus. The Armenian Plateau serves as a bridge between the Iranian and Anatolian highlands, but its southern ridge towers abruptly over the lowlands of Mesopotamia and Syria. It is traversed by still higher mountains, Ararat (Masis) being the highest point among them; it is nourished by a number of rivers, of which the Araxes (Eraskh), disgoring into the Caspian, and the high waters of the Tigris and the Euphrates are most notable; and it contains three great lakes: Van, Urmia, and Sevan. The depression of the Isthmus is, in turn, filled up with spurs from both the Caucasus and the Anti-Caucasus and is divided into two unequal parts by the most important of these, the Little Caucasus, or the Moschian (Likhi or Surami) mountains. This range runs from the middle of the Caucasus, in a south-westerly direction, to join the Pontic Alps, which are the north-western bastion of the Armenian Plateau. The smaller, western, division of the Isthmus is drained by many rivers, of which the principal are the Phasis (Rioni) and the Acampsis (Chorokhi) flowing into the Black Sea. The larger, eastern, division is in fact the basin of one great river, the Cyrus (Mtkvari, Kura) which, reinforced by tributaries, flows eastwards and, joining the Araxes, disembogues into the Caspian.

This is the locus of Caucasian society: the land of its two chief components, the Armenian and the Georgian nation. It is also their cradle. These two nations were born of the fusion that, within human memory, took place on the soil of Caucasia between peoples settled there from pre-historic times — they may for all intents and purposes be called autochthons or ‘proto-Caucasians’ — and several groups of newcomers. But there are, in the ethnogeny of the Armenians and of the Georgians, certain differences. First, whereas in the case of the Armenians the previous history of the autochthon is better known than that of the newcomer, the reverse is true in the case of the Georgians. And, secondly, in Armenia the autochthon was distinct ethnically and linguistically from the newcomer, while in Georgia certain affinities have been assumed between them.

2. An outline of the historical background of Caucasian society is, as has been noted, of utmost importance for a study of Christian Caucasia.<sup>1</sup> The

---

<sup>1</sup> A detailed treatment of proto-Caucasian and early Armeno-Georgian history, which is here briefly touched upon, will be found in N. Adontz, *Histoire d'Arménie* (Paris 1946); *Armenija v ěpoxu Justiniana* (St. Petersburg 1908); B. Piotrovskij, *Istorija i kul'tura Urartu* (Erivan 1944); H. Manandyan, *P'eodalizm ě hin Hayastanum: Aršakunineri ew marzpanu'yan šržan* (Erivan 1934); *K'nnakan tesu'yun hay žoļovrdi patmu'yan I* (Erivan 1945); *O neko-toryx spornyx problemax istorii i geografii drevnej Armenii* (Erivan 1956); *O torgovle i gorodax Armenii v svjazi s mirovoj torgovlej drevnix vremen* (Erivan 1954); R. Grousset, *Histoire de l'Arménie* (Paris 1947); A. Goetze, *Kleinasien* (*Kulturgeschichte des alten Orients* 3 [2nd ed.

subject, moreover, is quite interesting in itself and deserves a greater attention than it has hitherto received. The social history of Caucasia is marked by an extraordinary permanence of form, which offers a sharp contrast to the vicissitudes of its political history; this is a feature that must first strike the eye of the historian. The perdurable form in question is one of a strongly aristocratic society which combined in an unusual way the features of a feudal régime with those of a dynastic régime evolved from the earlier tribal conditions. Of these two components, the first-named is more familiar and less easily definable than the second. The genesis and functioning of feudal societies were recently made the subject of an interesting series of papers, in which, however, no notice was taken of Caucasian society.<sup>2</sup> Yet Caucasia is a rewarding subject for a study of this kind, and its feudalistic features owe their origin to precisely the same factors as do such features elsewhere.

Feudalism, accordingly, is born — posthumously as it were — of the marriage of two more or less moribund elements. One of them is the State: a civilized, bureaucratic and centralized, imperial, yet disintegrating polity — or, at least, an abortive attempt of form one.<sup>3</sup> The other element is the Tribe: a comparatively primitive tribal society in its last phase, which has been called 'the Heroic Age,' during which, under the impact of outside influence from a civilized State, the old ties of kinship that held it together in its earlier phases are, abruptly or gradually, disrupted and replaced by personal and contractual bonds of lord-vassal relationship. This relationship now obtains between the tribal dynasts emancipated from those ancient ties, on the one hand,

---

Munich 1957]) 187-200; I. Ĵavaxišvili, *K'art'veli eris istoria I* (4th ed. Tiflis 1951); W. Allen, *A History of the Georgian People* (London 1932); also Š. Amiranašvili, *Istorija gruzinskogo iskusstva I* (Moscow 1950). — Armenian and Georgian names and phrases are transcribed as they appear in the original: according to either the old or the new spelling as the case may be. Armenian and Georgian names transcribed into Russian are re-transcribed into English as they are in the original, with no attention paid to the Russian transcription. On the other hand, the various west European transcriptions of Armenian, Georgian, and Russian names of authors who have written in West European languages are everywhere respected.

<sup>2</sup> R. Coulborn, ed., *Feudalism in History* (Princeton 1956). There are a few passing references to Urartu and to Armenia, the latter rather in need of revision, because based on passing and rather unsatisfactory remarks in A. Christensen, *L'Iran sous les Sassanides* (2nd ed. Copenhagen 1944). But there is no mention of Georgia, which, after the appearance of the English work of Allen, ought not any longer to remain a *terra incognita*.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. J. Strayer and R. Coulborn, 'The Idea of Feudalism,' *Feud. in Hist.* I/i.7; D. Bodde, 'Feudalism in China,' *ibid.* II/iv. 90; Coulborn, 'A Comparative Study of Feudalism,' *ibid.* III.189, 197-198, 236-253, 256-257, 270. — A 'dying empire' is not, however, always found at the basis of a feudal society; cf. Strayer and Coulborn 7; B. Brundage, 'Feudalism in Ancient Mesopotamia and Iran,' *ibid.* II/v.100, but cf. 116, and Goetze, *Kleinasien* 64-81 for Akkadian influence and Assyrian colonization in Anatolia.

and, on the other, the war bands of their followers: the equally emancipated successors of the tribal army-people of old.<sup>4</sup> The meeting of these two elements and the consequent birth of a feudal society may take place on the territory of the State, owing to a barbarian invasion; or it may result from the projection of the image, the idea, of the State upon a tribal territory.<sup>5</sup> The feudal society thus born partakes of both inheritances. It can be described as a system of government, a polity, which is marked by the diffusion of sovereign power. This diffusion is due to the adaptation of the highly developed governmental machinery of the disintegrating State to the old, tribal 'in-group' psychology of the war bands and to the consequent rise of the 'elemental strong fief' — the very nucleus of feudalism. Sovereignty in such a society is pulverized in two ways. Vertically, through being monopolized, diminishingly, by several degrees of a class of landed warriors, or nobles. And horizontally, through the attachment of the rights of government to a number of local territorial units, lordships or fiefs, into which the polity is divided and which are held by the nobles. There is, nevertheless, also unity in this society, besides diversity; it derives from the tradition of the centralized State, which, once enforced by the ruler-subject bonds, is now effected by the lord-vassal relations of the pyramidal ruling group. These relations, closely connected with the conditional character of all land tenure as a recompense for service, converge in the person of the supreme overlord, or king, who is the theoretical source of sovereignty and of landownership in the polity. It is, moreover, of the nature of the feudal ruling group — an effect of the pulverization of inheritable political power — that private aspects of its existence are endowed with a public character.<sup>6</sup>

The other component of Caucasian society may, in contradistinction to feudalism, be termed 'dynasticism.' The same elements as with feudalism contribute to its formation, but here the Tribe is basic and the State secondary.

---

<sup>4</sup> Cf. Strayer and Coulborn, *op. cit.* 7-8; E. Reischauer, 'Japanese Feudalism,' *Feud. in Hist.* II/iii.28; Bodde, *Feud. in China* 90; Coulborn, *Comp. Study of Feud.* 188-203, 257, 270, 374. — For the Heroic Age, see H. M. Chadwick's classical *The Heroic Age* (Cambridge 1912).

<sup>5</sup> Cf. Coulborn, *Comp. Study of Feud.* 197-199, 364, 374-375.

<sup>6</sup> Cf. Strayer and Coulborn, *Idea of Feud.* 4-5; Strayer, 'Feudalism in Western Europe,' *Feud. in Hist.* II/ii.16-18; Bodde, *Feud. in China* 87, 90-91; E. Kantorowicz, 'Feudalism in the Byzantine Empire,' *ibid.* II/viii.152; Coulborn, *Comp. Study of Feud.* 190-191, 196. — The concluding sentence of the above paragraph is nearer to truth, I believe, than the assertion that in feudalism 'political authority is treated as private possession' (Strayer and Coulborn 5). The *reyes católicos*, to give an instance, did not hold their crowns as private possession, but such was their position that a private act of theirs, their marriage, entailed an event of public significance, the union of Castile and Aragon. To say, moreover, that 'political power [in a feudal society] is personal rather than institutional' (*ibid.*) is to suggest that the two terms are mutually exclusive; yet political power can be both personal and institutional, as in a monarchy; the antithesis is rather between 'institutional' and 'private.'



Dynasticism is the result not so much of a disruption of a tribal society and of the meeting of the Heroic-Age warriors with a disintegrating empire, as of a gradual evolution, largely no doubt under the external influence of a State tradition, of clans and tribes into a people-state. This evolution is achieved through the acquisition of a higher degree of civilization and of the prerequisites of statehood, that is, sovereignty, independence, or at least autonomy, and territory. The monarchical régimes thus arisen are more directly the successors of tribal patriarchy than those resulting from 'Heroic' conquests, and they display a closer connexion than do the others of polity and religion; the kings in such régimes tend to be sacral or divine, or — to put it another way — theophanic, and their capitals to be holy cities.<sup>7</sup>

---

<sup>7</sup> Cf. Chadwick, *Heroic Age* 376-378, 390-391; there is an intermediary type: a nation migrating *in toto*; *ibid.* 378. — The hierophany, or theophany, of kingship must be regarded an integral part of what E. Voegelin has called 'the cosmological myth.' 'The symbolization of society and its order [he writes] as an analogue of the cosmos and its order... is generally the first symbolic form created by societies when they rise above the level of tribal organization... It is the mythical expression of the participation, experienced as real, of the order of society in the divine being that also orders the cosmos. To be sure, the cosmos and the political cosmion remain separate existences, but... the participation is so intimate, indeed, that in spite of the separateness of existences, empire and cosmos are parts of one embracing order'; *Order and History I: Israel and Revelation* (Baton Rouge 1956) 5, 14, 27. Of inner necessity, then, the rulers of the cosmion stand in a special relation with the rulers of the cosmos. The character of that special relation must have varied in different places and at different times, exactly as do the interpretations of it by modern specialists. The Anglo-Scandinavian school has seen the 'divine kingship pattern' throughout the ancient East Mediterranean world; others regard this as over-simplifying and, in many cases, overstating the matter; see the discussion of the problem in J. de Fraine, *L'aspect religieux de la royauté israélite: L'institution monarchique dans l'Ancien Testament et dans les textes mésopotamiens* (Rome 1954). Actually, as is made clear by the following statement of an eminent representative of the School, 'divine kingship,' a few certain cases of the deification of living kings apart, means far less than the name connotes: 'But the point is, of course, to keep clearly in mind... what the king's divinity really means. I believe that even the man of antiquity knew as well as does the « non-civilized » man of to-day the difference between a god and a king, be the latter ever so divine. That the king is god, implies, in my opinion, above all two things: the king is the human maintainer of the divine ideology — the king as « law-king-sky-god » in Hocart's terminology — and the king has — as « executive king » — to represent, especially in the cult, one or several divine characters. But this said, it is also said that the king is in no way just « another feeble creature »'; I. Engnell, *Studies in Divine Kingship in the Ancient Near East* (Uppsala 1943) 31. It is interesting to compare this admission with the conclusions (regarding Mesopotamian kingship) reached by Fr. de Fraine, who represents an opposition to the 'Uppsalians': 'Toute royauté, en effet, consacre le roi comme « lumière des dieux », c'est-à-dire comme un reflet vivant de la divinité. Mais ce reflet se trouve perpétuellement conditionné par une « bénédiction constante » des dieux: si cette faveur se détourne du souverain, il ne reste plus l'être privilégié qui régnait au-dessus des hommes, il retombe dans la foule anonyme, vidé de tout ce qui faisait sa grandeur. La divinisation du roi ne fait que donner un semblant d'absolu et de définitif à un homme,



Often the geography of a region, such as Greece or Caucasia, favors the development within it of numerous small polities and prevents their absorption into one large political formation. When, thus, a number of small States coexist in a geographically circumscribed and culturally unified area, the group of the kingly dynasties ruling in them, though each unique in its own polity, come to form together one class, as it were, in that multiplicity of States. That class, then, constitutes the highest stratum of the society of the entire area, cutting across its political divisions.<sup>8</sup> And it becomes crystallized as a social class long before the other social strata are definitively formed, that is, before the original tribal society of free warriors is finally stratified as one in which, besides the dynasts, there are also lineages of clan-chiefs and family-heads — the inchoate nobility — as well as the rest of the people.<sup>9</sup> This first-formed class may be termed 'dynastic aristocracy,' the adjective fully adverting to the fact of the essential difference between royalty, on the one hand, and the ordinary non-sovereign aristocracy, or nobility, on the other. The difference, moreover, is one of both the time and the manner of genesis.

It is owing to the initiative of the dynastic aristocracy, spurred, unquestionably, by the example of a neighboring imperial State, that people-states are fused into federative systems. A larger polity, a *σύστημα μείζον*,<sup>10</sup> is born in a given area, and the foundations of a nation coextensive with it are laid, when one of the local kings begins to reduce to a position of dependence his *confrères* in the vicinity. With this, the *étatiste* element enters the stage to

---

« qui n'est rien par lui-même, mais tout par la divinité »; *Aspect religieux* 261, and: 'En vérité, les différences entre les dieux et les rois étaient, sous certains rapports, assez minimes'; *ibid.* 217. There is hardly any discordance between them. Cf. also *ibid.* 57-74, 169-186, 217-263, 285-309, 342-370 (and valuable notes). Formal deification of kings is observable in Mesopotamia three times: with the Sargonids of Akkad; with the III Dynasty of Ur and those of Isin and Larsa; and with the Kassites; *ibid.* 218. In these circumstances, 'theophanic kingship' seems preferable to 'divine kingship,' since it is applicable to the sacral and sacred as well as to the deified monarchs.

<sup>8</sup> This is the class of the Homeric (σκηπτούχοι) βασιλῆες; cf. Chadwick, *Heroic Age* 378-382, 391-392; J. B. Bury, *A History of Greece* (3rd ed. London 1951) 54-55; M. Rostovtzeff, *A History of the Ancient World I* (Oxford 1930) 183-184, 187, and (for the Aegean world) 87; G. Calhoun, 'Classes and Masses in Homer,' *Classical Philology* 29/3 (1934) 192-208; 29/4 (1934) 301-316; Jessen, 'Basileus,' *RE* 3/1.56-62.

<sup>9</sup> That the Homeric Age already saw the rise of a non-dynastic nobility, distinct from the dynastic *Basileids*, is affirmed by Adolf Fanta (*Der Staat in der Ilias und Odyssee* [Innsbruck 1882]) and his school and denied by others, including Chadwick (*Heroic Age* 364 and n.2) and especially Calhoun (*Classes and Masses*). For the rise of the Iranian gentry, see Adontz, *L'aspect iranien du servage* (Recueil de la Société Jean Bodin 1937) 144; cf. Christensen, *Iran Sass.* 111-112. Internal warfare and tribal conquests, too, must introduce a stratification of the conquerors and the conquered in a tribal society.

<sup>10</sup> Cf. Strabo 15.3.2, on Achaemenid Iran. — For a similar process in Hellas, see Bury, *Hist. of Greece* 54.

counterbalance the dynastic. A hierarchy of political, but also economic, or at least fiscal and social, relationships is established which holds together the super-dynast or High King, the other dynasts, and occasionally also the ex-dynasts, i.e., those who lost their rights in the process, in the common governance of the nation.<sup>11</sup> The super-dynast, in such a federation, invariably tends to reduce the subordinate princes to the position of his nobles, but the princes, some of them still in full possession of sovereign rights inherent in their rulership of territorialized tribes and clans, form, even when so reduced, the uppermost stratum of the nobility, which is distinct from its non-dynastic layers.<sup>12</sup>

In societies gradually evolved from tribal conditions, the dynastic element is powerful enough to survive the inherent hostility and the imported *étatisme* of the super-dynastic Crown. But in most feudal societies, sprung from the 'Heroic' disruption of tribal ways, followed in many cases by an uprooting migration, the forms of the State easily stifle the dynasticist forms. Thus, instead of remaining distinct from the rest of the nobility, the dynasts of the Heroic Age fuse together with their own followers and with the remaining bureaucrats of dead empires, to form the single class of feudal lords, without distinction or even memory of their disparate origins, and with whatever gradations between them being entirely dependent on possession and function.<sup>13</sup>

<sup>11</sup> See also Chadwick, *Heroic Age* 374-375, 391, for the 'fatherhood' and 'sonship' among kings. Upon the whole, the case of Caucasia closely approximates to that of Japan, for which see Reischander, *Jap. Feud.* 26-28; and Coulborn, *Comp. Study of Feud.* 194-196, 198, 221 n.11. Possibly, Japan's beginnings were dynasticist, and feudalism was, as in Caucasia, only subsequently superadded to dynasticism; but in Japan, unlike Caucasia, feudalism seems to have supplanted dynasticism.

<sup>12</sup> Besides Caucasia, Russia and Lithuania, i.e., the lands of the Rurikid and Gediminid inheritance, present a typical example of a surviving dynasticist society with their multiplicity of princes (*knjaź, kunigas, rikis*), reduced to obedience by super-dynastic 'Grand Dukes' and ultimately mediatized though always distinct from the non-princely families of the nobility. This society, moreover, never passed beyond what has been called the 'proto-feudal' stage; cf. M. Szeftel, 'Aspects of Feudalism in Russian History,' *Feud. in Hist.* II/ix. Unlike the aristocracy of Caucasia, these princes seem for the most part to have belonged to one or the other of only two chief dynasties, of Rurik and of Gediminas; unless this unity of descent be in many cases legendary, like that of the Armenian Haykids and Iberian K'art'losids (*infra* at nn. 90-94, 120-122). However, in Lithuania and Western Ruś, there were also a number of princes not belonging to either of the two official houses; cf. J. Wolff, *Kniazowie Litewsko-ruscy* (Warsaw 1895).

<sup>13</sup> Cf. my article 'La noblesse géorgienne: sa genèse et sa structure,' *Rivista Araldica* 54/9 (1956) 262: 'La survivance de l'aristocratie tribale-dynastique en Orient méditerranéen et en Europe Orientale résulte en ce que la noblesse y diffère de sa sœur occidentale par son caractère nettement dichotomique. Elle est de par nature divisée en deux couches ou ordres distincts: des dynastes et des guerriers, ou, pour employer la désignation officielle, des Princes et des Nobles. La dignité princière en Caucasic et en Europe Orientale est presque unique-

The dynastic régime, to repeat, is one of the aboriginal multiplicity of the holders of sovereign power within a geographical, ethnic, and cultural unity of a given region. This multiplicity is reconciled with the superadded political unity of that region through the — upward — movement of subordination of dynasts to the control of a super-dynast and through their becoming occasionally 'mediatized' or reduced to the uppermost rung of the nobiliary ladder. In such a régime, the sovereign power is, as it were, 'polygenetic.' In contradistinction to it, the feudal régime presupposes the fragmentation of the theoretically 'monogenetic' sovereign power, and one originally coextensive with the entire area, through its delegation — the downward movement — to an essentially non-sovereign, noble group. The difference between the two modes of polity is expressed, moreover, not only in political terms, but also in those of land tenure. While dynasticist landownership is allodial, that is, absolute and inalienable, feudal land tenure is conditional, contractual, and limited. As with the political aspect of the difference, it is a question of the multiple, 'polygenetic' *dominium directum*, as opposed to the unitary, 'monogenetic' one, which reduces the land tenure of all save the supreme lord to a mere *dominium utile*. Also, allodial landownership is anterior to, and independent of the status of political, and also social and economic, subordination which one allodialist may enter as regards another. Feudal landownership, on the other hand, owes its *raison d'être* to the political, social and economic, dependence of vassal on suzerain. The unitary efforts of a dynasticist-allodial society are thus unconnected with land tenure, whereas a feudal society is one in which the diffusion of 'monogenetic' sovereignty is inextricably connected with the utilization of the land that is subject to the *dominium directum* of the king.

The feudal régime can, in a sense, be regarded as something of a middle way between dynasticism and an anti-nobiliary and bureaucratic, total *étatisme*, such as characterized the Roman Empire. And usually it supplants dynasticism early in the history of a society; of this, Western Europe and Iran offer typical examples.<sup>14</sup> In Caucasia, on the contrary, dynasticism survived, for

---

ment l'expression d'une origine dynastique. En Occident, d'autre part, la haute noblesse et la noblesse ordinaire sont pour la plupart d'une même origine: maisons de guerriers et de fonctionnaires avec quelques races dynastiques parsemées ci et là, et la division même en ces deux couches n'exprime généralement que les différences de possession et de fonction et non pas celles d'origine.' Cf. Manandyan, *Peodal. Hay.* 241-242.

<sup>14</sup> As a result, notable differences of emphasis obtained between the Caucasian and the West European nobiliary structure. 'Ainsi, en Occident, les noms nobles et surtout les titres sont pour la plupart territoriaux — l'idée de ce qu'on a; en Orient, les noms nobles tendent à être dynastiques et donc patronymiques — l'idée de ce qu'on est — et les titres à y être attachés. En Occident, la dignité d'une maison dépend surtout des terres et des offices — et la terre elle-même est devenue un office en l'espèce du fief; en Orient, elle repose sur l'origine ou « sang », de quoi il résulte que tandis qu'en Occident la tendance est vers la

reasons already indicated; and the endeavor of the Crown to reduce it resulted in merely superadding feudalist features to it. Caucasian society, accordingly, was characterized by a blending of the two modes. But the historians who have dealt with it had been trained with the pattern of Western Europe before their eyes; and, since in that pattern dynasticism figures only in its inchoate, indeed pre-natal, stage, these historians were able to discern only this stage of dynasticism in Caucasia, and they qualified the subsequent social and political development as solely feudalistic, although the thoughtful among them registered what they could only describe as 'patriarchal survivals.'<sup>15</sup>

3. To a very large extent, the Caucasian historical development reflects the social process, just outlined, of the evolution of dynasticism and of the subsequent imposition upon it of feudalistic forms. The uninterrupted civilized existence of Caucasia can be traced, through the rise and fall of political structures and the change of ethnic factors, back to at least the middle of the second millennium B.C., the epoch of the emergence of the New Hittite Empire in Anatolia and of the Hurrian empire of Mitanni (Subartu) in Upper Mesopotamia; while vestiges of man have been found on its territory that go back to the early Stone Age. In the fourteenth century B.C., the Hittite records begin to mention a number of States — Ishuwa, Ḫayasa-Azzi, Bala, Dumana, and others — situated in present-day western and southern Armenia, between precisely these two empires, and some of them vacillating in their vassal allegiance between them.<sup>16</sup> It is to the same, or possibly an earlier, epoch that the centres of a highly developed Bronze- and Copper-Age civilization of Anatolian, Mesopotamian, and Aegean affinities — brought to light by recent archaeological discoveries in central and western Georgia and in central and eastern Armenia — seem to belong. Centres of an apparently related civilization, possibly belonging to the third millennium B.C., have been discovered in the Kuban region (Maykop), north of the Caucasus, and at Koban in Ossetia.

By 1300 B.C., Mitanni had ceased to exist under the double pressure of the Hittites and the Assyrians, who then fell to disputing between them the dom-

---

loi de primogéniture, celle de l'Orient est au contraire de tous les membres d'une maison, tous ceux qui partagent le même sang, à en partager aussi d'une manière égale les titres, les biens et parfois même les offices...'; Toumanoff, *Nobl. géorg.* 261.

<sup>15</sup> Cf. Adontz, *Armenija* 194-195, 434-436, 441, 444; Manandyan, 'Problema obščestvennogo stroja doaršakidskoj Armenii,' *Istoričeskie Zapiski* 15 (1945) 21-22, 27-28; *P'eodal Hay.* 241-242. On the other hand, extremist views have not been wanting, like those, e.g., of A. Pertzold, *Der Kaukasus* II (Leipzig 1867) 67, and A. v. Haxthausen, *Zur Jurisprudenz in Transkaukasien* I (Leipzig 1856) 217, who denied Armenian feudalism, or of X. Samuelyan, *Hin hay iravunk'i patmut'yunē* I (Erivan 1939), who denies Armenian allodialism.

<sup>16</sup> For the relative geographical position of the proto-Caucasian States of the Hittite and Assyrian records, I have followed Manandyan's remarkable study, *O nek. sporn. probl.*

inance of the north. The Assyrian records, succeeding in this the Hittite, speak of Caucasia as divided into several federations of tribal kings. Such were Ishuwa-Nairi, in the valley of the Eastern Euphrates or Arsanias (Arat-sani); Ḫayasa-Alshe (or Alzi), north-east of it and north-west of lake Van; Daiaeni, in north-western Armenia; Uruaṭri, south of Van; and the enclaves made by the peoples of the Kashkai and the Mushki (on which later). The balance of power between these proto-Caucasian polities appears to have been precarious, with some of them, under the impact no doubt of the Hittite or the Ḫurrian imperial idea, attempting to enforce their hegemony on others and then having to face Assyrian attacks from the south. It was the people of Uruaṭri, or Urartu (as it was called in the later Assyrian sources) that, after spreading from their original homeland to the east and north of lake Van — the land of Biaina —, had by the ninth century B.C. come to realize this imperial idea. The history of Urartu's Caucasian empire is quite well known not only from the Assyrian documents, but also from its own rather copious monuments, chiefly cuneiform inscriptions both in the Urartian language and in Assyrian. Between the ninth and the sixth century, this powerful, prosperous, and civilized State, memorable for its Cyclopean architecture and its irrigation works, controlled from its centre round Van the major part of Caucasia and proved an indomitable, and indeed formidable, foe to the Assyrian Monarchy, and its rival in the acquisition of the Mittanian inheritance.<sup>17</sup>

The Urartian phase is marked off from those that precede it by the appearance of certain feudalistic features that was consequent on its federative character, and possibly also inspired by the Mesopotamian imperial example and by the memories of the Hittites and the Ḫurrians. The Kings of Van (Biaina) and of the city of Tushpa, on the lake, rulers of the nucleus of the federation, exercised their superior authority over an increasing number of dynasts and people-states. They assumed the Mesopotamian imperial title of King of Kings (*erili erilaue* in Urartian, *šar šarrāni* in Assyrian) and the cosmocratic claims it carried; and they undoubtedly were, like the Hittite and the Mesopotamian monarchs, theophanic kings.<sup>18</sup> As can be inferred from the

<sup>17</sup> Urartian has also been called 'Vannic,' 'Alarodian,' or 'Chaldian/Ḫaldian.' 'Urartu' is used here as an equivalent of 'Vannic Monarchy' and 'Urartian' as that which pertains to it. Piotrovskij, *Urartu*, uses this term in a narrower sense of the nucleus of that monarchy and as distinct from the other Caucasian people-states contained in it. Here, 'proto-Caucasian' denotes also the ethnic and political groups that were not included in Urartu. — The Assyrian *Urartu/Uraštu* of the Babylonians is not a word that can be found in the documents written in the Urartian language; instead, they use the word *Biaini/a* (Van); Adontz, *Hist. d'Arm.* 270.

<sup>18</sup> In addition to the titles: 'King of Kings,' 'Great King,' 'Mighty King,' 'King of Biaina,' 'King of Nairi,' 'Prince of the City of Tušpa,' the Vannic emperors used also the title of 'King of the Universe [of All]' (in Assyrian: *šar kiššati*); Adontz, *Hist. d'Arm.* 213-

monuments, this Vannic empire was composed of three kinds of territories. First, the Urartian Kingdom of Van itself, which was divided into provinces administered by governors appointed by the King of Kings; next, there were the vassal States; and, finally, the tributary States. This division reflected the pattern of expansion followed by the Kings of Van. At first, a tribute (*meše*) would be imposed upon a dynast; next, it would be attempted to reduce him to the position of a vassal (*buru*); finally, if that proved successful, further attempts were made to annex the vassal territory and to convert it into a province. This pattern could not, obviously, always be followed through to the end, and a great part of the Vannic empire was composed of vassal kingdoms and thus retained a federated character. Vannic expansionism seems to have brought into existence a group, or class, of ex-dynasts who may have retained some reduced rights and who ranked below their still sovereign colleagues. Thus, the documents mention the 'Great Ones' (*ašariduti* = Assyrian *rabute*) besides the officials and the warriors. It is difficult to tell how crystallized these strata were; at any rate they offer a parallel to the social organization

---

215: in particular Sarduri I (cf. *ibid.* 145; C. F. Lehmann-Haupt, ed. *Corpus inscriptionum Chaldicarum* I [Berlin/Leipzig 1928] 1-3, Pl. xl, xli = F. König, ed., 'Handbuch der chaldischen Inschriften,' *Archiv für Orientforschung* 8/1 [1955] 1 a-c) and Išpuini (cf. Tseretheli, 'Études ourartéennes,' IV: 'La stèle de Kélichine,' *Revue d'Assyriologie* 47 [1953] 132-133, 135-136; *Corpus inscr. chald.* 12 = König 9. The *šu-ra-a-û-e* of the Urartian version of this bilingual stele [line 3] Tseretheli considers to be the equivalent of the *kiššati* of the Assyrian version [line 2]; others would see in it the territorial epithet: 'of Šura'; Manandyan, *O nek. sporn. probl.* 13-14; cf. Adontz, *loc. cit.*; Goetze, *Kleinasien* 191). In this, they were the heirs of the Mesopotamian, rather than the Anatolian, tradition, for the Hittite kings do not appear to have used any cosmocratic titles; cf. Goetze, *Kleinasien* 88; and, for the problem of cosmocracy in Mesopotamia and Anatolia, K. Schwarzenberg, *Adler und Drache: Der Weltherrschaftsgedanke* (Vienna/Munich 1958) 22-33, 289-291. To borrow the terminology adopted in the latter work, while the Urartian monarchs belonged to the category of the world-claiming *Grosskönige*, those of the Hittites, though vastly more powerful in their day, can be classed only with the — imperial indeed, but not cosmocratic — *Hochkönige*; Schwarzenberg 289. — The available Urartian sources show the Vannic Monarchy to have been strongly theocratic; Adontz 227-230, 247-254. In the light of modern interpretation and Hittite and Sumero-Akkadian example, this can mean only the Vannic emperor's theophanic character, for which see *supra* n. 7. For the religious connotation of 'King of Kings,' see J. G. Griffith, 'Βασιλεὺς βασιλέων: Remarks on the History of a Title,' *Classical Philology* 48 (1953) 145-154. The sacred character of kingship must be presumed in the case of subordinate kings no less than in that of the High King. — The King of Urartu was called 'brother' by the King of Assyria, until Sarduri III, c. 648/636 B.C., treated Asurbanipal as a 'father,' as is clear from the latter's *Annals*; Adontz 139-140 (who tries, against Winckler and Streck, to explain this change merely by the difference in the age of the two sovereigns). — The cosmocratic claims were a corollary of the 'cosmological myth,' for which see *supra* n.7. For the facility of coexistence among several neighbouring cosmions, see Voegelin, *Order and History* 17.



of the New Hittite Empire.<sup>19</sup> In the opinion of Adontz these Grandees were possibly 'les grands seigneurs terriens dont les uns, issus des anciens dynastes déchus, auraient gardé une partie de leur propriété patrimoniale; les autres auraient été dotés par les rois de terres à titre de fiefs... Les *rabuti* de ce genre formaient probablement la noblesse féodale et étaient obligés à tenir sur pied de guerre un certain nombre de combattants destinés à prendre part, à l'appel du roi, à des entreprises militaires.'<sup>20</sup> Urartian society appears, then, to have been one in which, in addition to the dynastic aristocracy, there already existed the somewhat lower stratum of the ordinary nobility and in which there obtained some feudalistic traits, notably, the lord-vassal relations binding together the king, the dynasts, and the nobles, and also the conjunction of land tenure with the service to the king.

Meantime, between the eighth and the sixth century B.C., a new era was ushered in in the history of the Eastern Mediterranean, as old empires foundered and new peoples arose to shake the civilized world and to found, some of them, empires even greater. In the course of its almost incessant struggle against Assyrian aggression, Urartu had grown weak and was further weakened by the inroads of the Cimmerians and the Scythians. Then, in 612 B.C., crushed between the old anvil of the Babylonians and the new hammer of the Medes, Assyria ceased to exist; and, soon thereafter, between 612 and 585, the Vannic Monarchy crumbled in its turn and its territory was included in the new empire of the Medes. On that territory, a novel ethnic and political factor had meanwhile made its appearance. Coming, it seems, in the wake of the Cimmerians out of the west, some Thraco-Phrygian tribes had established themselves in the Armenian Plateau and there mingled with the ancient proto-Caucasian people of *Hayasa*. Together they formed something of a federation, in which at first the former, then the latter held sway. This new ethnic and political formation fell heir to a part of the Vannic succession. In this, it was, apparently, supported by the Median overlords, who may have wished to exercise their control over the Urartian lands through this subordinate young power. Of the eventual blending of the newcomers with the Urartians and other proto-Caucasians, the Armenian nation was ultimately born. The process of blending was, however, a very gradual one. The new people-state — we may call it 'proto-Armenian'<sup>21</sup> — did not spread over the entire territory of Urartu, but was only able at first to secure footholds in the western and southern regions of the Armenian Plateau. The inhabitants of its northern and western

<sup>19</sup> Brundage, *Feud. in Mesop. and Iran* 100-102; Goetze, *Kleinasien* 95-109.

<sup>20</sup> Adontz, *Hist. d'Arm.* 219.

<sup>21</sup> The origin of the ethnonym 'Armenian' is still unclear (*infra*, nn. 32, 114); I therefore hesitate to apply it, without any further qualification, to the Thraco-Phrygians; this hesitation, by the way, has not always been shared by modern historiography.



parts, some of them former members of the Vannic Monarchy, and others who had never been connected with it, long remained independent of the proto-Armenians and unmixed with them.<sup>22</sup> *A fortiori*, the inhabitants of the Ponto-Caspian Isthmus were untouched by them. There were also in Caucasia a number of Scythian and Cimmerian enclaves.

The Isthmus, especially its western moiety, which today is the land of the Georgians, had meanwhile become the destination of another ethnic stream. This was the slow and steady infiltration, going on between the eighth and the fourth century B.C., of various, chiefly Anatolian peoples, who lingered for a while on the Pontic fringe of the Armenian highlands before descending into the valleys below. Three of these peoples: the Kashkai (Gashgash), the Muskhi,

---

<sup>22</sup> In their treatment of the Thraco-Phrygian advent to Caucasia, Adontz and most Western scholars tend to underestimate the proto-Caucasian Ḫayasa and to represent, in accordance with a fashionable *cliché*, the newcomers as 'conquering Aryans/Indo-Europeans'; but, upon the whole, modern Caucasiology has shown a healthy reaction against such *simpliste* views (cf. *infra* n.30). On the other hand, some Caucasiologists go to the opposite extreme of ignoring or negating (with, e.g., Piotrovskij and Ľap'anc'yan) the Indo-European Thraco-Phrygian admixture in the proto-Armenians; Piotrovskij, *Urartu*; G. Ľap'anc'yan, (in Russian transcription: Kapancjan), *Xajasa — Kolybel' Armjan: Ėtnogenez Armjan i ix načal'naja istorija (Istoriko-Lingvističeskie Raboty*; Erivan 1956). Piotrovskij, however, is right in interpreting the rise of the latter as the formation of still another federation, rather than a conquest, for which there is no indication. What has been in the past taken as a reference to such a conquest, the struggle of the Armeni and the Chaldaei (rather: Chaldi) as reported in the *Cyropaedia* of Xenophon, in actual fact indicates nothing of the sort. The Chaldeans do not represent the Urartians in general (as has been held ever after Lehmann-Haupt), but a particular north-western proto-Caucasian people of the Ḫal(Xal-) ethnicon, of which another form is 'Chalybes,' and who may or may not have been included in the Urartian empire; *Urartu* 326-331; Adontz, *Armenija* 58, 398; *Hist. d'Arm.* 270; *infra* n. 114. If a conquest there had been at all, it must have been effected by the Thraco-Phrygians only over the Ḫayasa, else it was merely an infiltration by the latter of the territory of the former. At any rate, this must have taken place before the rise of the Medes, who would not have allowed such a conquest or infiltration of their own imperial territory; it most probably occurred during the Cimmerian invasion. The mingling of the Indo-European Thraco-Phrygians and the proto-Caucasian Ḫayasa must at all events have implied a struggle of the two elements for predominance. The former must at first have achieved it; hence the basically Indo-European character of the Armenian language. But the latter must soon enough have replaced it in that position. Thus, the ethnicon *Hay* became the Armenian word for 'Armenian,' and, as Marr, *Izbrannye Raboty* I (Leningrad 1933) 39, has noted, while the Indo-European linguistic elements are at the base of the popular speech (including, e.g., agricultural terms), the proto-Caucasian Ḫayasa linguistic elements are at the base of the old or classical literary language (*grabar*), i.e., the language of the upper class; Piotrovskij, *Urartu* 334-335, 338. The Median empire-builders, finding, upon their advent, the proto-Armenian enclave in the Urartian territory, tended to patronize it; J. Markwart, *Die Entstehung und Wiederherstellung der armenischen Nation* (Berlin 1919) 16; Manandyan, *O torgovle* 44-45. Possibly the linguistic affinity determined their choice.

and the Tabal, had a long history behind them and had already made the passage from the tribe to the people-state. The Kashkai, a group of proto-Hattian affinities and probably originating from the eastern shore of the Propontis, appear in the Hittite records of the mid-fourteenth century as a menace to the Hittite empire from the Pontic regions north of it, where they had in the meantime taken their abode. They participated in the destruction of that empire about 1200 B.C., penetrated western Armenia, and then moved southwards, where they encountered the Assyrians. Some of them were repulsed and passed north-eastwards to Pontic Caucasia, where they were known as the Qulḫi to the Urartians and, subsequently, as the Colchi to the Greeks. Others formed a State in Cappadocia which in the eighth century became a vassal of Assyria.<sup>23</sup>

The Mushki, who represented most probably the pre-Indo-European population of Phrygia, made their appearance in the Assyrian records in the mid-twelfth century, when, after the downfall of the Hittite Monarchy, they founded a State of considerable moment in Cappadocia, referred to in the Bible as Mosoch;<sup>24</sup> and they also struck at Armenia. The close southern neighbour of the Mushki was the people-state of Tabal (Tibal, Tibar), the Thubal of the Bible, where it is invariably coupled with Mosoch.<sup>25</sup> It seems to have been already known to Babylonian sources of the third millennium B.C.; at any rate, it definitively emerged in the light of history after the Hittite collapse, in parts of Cilicia and Cappadocia, and was from the eleventh century a vassal of the Assyrians. Both the Mushkians and the Tabalians possessed a high degree of civilization and a renown for metallurgy, especially iron. The Cimmerian invasion of the seventh century dislodged them; some, then, moved north-eastwards and were known to the Greeks, in the sixth and fifth centuries, as inhabiting the Pontic regions and reduced both politically and culturally, under the name of the Moschi and the Tibareni. A century or so afterwards, these two peoples, the latter then called Iberians (Iberes), appear settled in

---

<sup>23</sup> Additional information can be found in R. C. Thompson, 'Assyria,' CAH 2.239, 249; D. G. Hogarth, 'The Hittites of Asia Minor,' *ibid.* 271; S. Smith, 'The Supremacy of Assyria,' CAH 3.55; Goetze, *Kleinasien* 178-179, 185; E. Cavaignac, *Le Monde méditerranéen* (Histoire du Monde 2; Paris 1929) 57, 62, 74; Adontz, *Hist. d'Arm.* 275-277; Manandyan, *O nek. sporn. probl.* 85-89; B. Kuftin, *Materialy k arzeologii Kolxidy II* (Tiflis 1950); Ruge, 'Kolchis,' RE 11/1.1070-1071; E. Diehl, 'Phasis' (1,2) RE 19/2.1886-1895; Th. Reinach, *Mithridate Eupator, roi de Pont* (Paris 1890) 77-78, 221-224, 301, 389. — The earliest Greek references are in Hecataeus fr. 188; Scylax, *Per.* 81; Aeschylus, *Prom. vinct.* 415. — The root of the ethnicon is K-S, for which see B. Hrozný, *Histoire de l'Asie Antérieure, de l'Inde et de la Crète* (Paris 1947) 77-83; *infra* n.114.

<sup>24</sup> Gen. 10.2; 1 Par. 1.5, 17; Eze. 27.13; 32.36; 38.2, 3; 39.1.

<sup>25</sup> *Ibid.* and Gen. 4.22.

the valleys of the Cyrus and the Acampsis; there they were subsequently to form the East Georgian State of Iberia.<sup>26</sup>

The previous history of two other important proto-Georgian tribes, the K'art's (K'art'vels) and the Suans is not very clear.<sup>27</sup> At all events, the mingling of these and other predominantly Anatolian peoples with the local population

<sup>26</sup> For additional information, see S. H. Langdon, 'The Dynasties of Akkad and Lagash,' CAH 1.418; Thompson, *Assyria* 247-249; Hogarth, *Hittites* 272, 274; *idem*, 'The Hittites of Syria,' CAH 3.137-138; *idem*, 'Lydia and Ionia,' *ibid.* 503; Smith, *Supr. of Assy.* 55; G. B. Gray and M. Cary, 'The Reign of Darius,' CAH 4.195; Goetze, *Kleinasien* 179, 185, 200, 202; Cavaignac, *Monde méd.* 74; Adontz, *Hist. d'Arm.* 277-278; S. Jānašia, 'T'ubal-Tabal, Tibareni, Iberi,' *Bulletin de l'Institut Marr de Langues, d'Histoire et de Culture matérielle* 1 (1937) 185-245; 'Ujvelesi erovneli c'noba k'art'velt'a pirvel sac'xovrisis šesaxeb maxlobeli aḡmosavlet'is istoriis sanat'leze,' *ibid.* 5-6 (1940) 633-694; Reinach, *Mithridate* 17-20. — The earliest Greek references are in Hecataeus fr. 188, 193 [*Tiβaγοί*]; Scylax, *Per.* 87; Herodotus 3.94; 7.78; Xenophon, *Anab.* 5.5. In the late-Classical times, some of the Tibareni remained in the Pontic regions, in Lesser Armenia and in Colchis; Strabo 12.3.28-29; cf. Plutarch, *Lucullus* 19.1. Others had remained in the Cilician Taurus; Cicero, *Ad fam.* 15.4. — The roots of the two ethnica are M-S and B-L, for which see *infra* n. 114. Marr postulated the following equation: Sumer-Thubal-Tibar-Hiber-Speir; *Izbr. raboty* 22 n.3, 112, 225. And now official Soviet historiography accepts the derivation of 'Iberia' from the ethnicon of the Saspeires (N. Berjenišvili *et al.*, *Istoriia Gruzii* I [Tiflis 1946] 17), who appear to have been a remnant of the Subareans or Ḫurrians, and who, together with the (Ḫurrian) Matieni and the (Urat'ian) Alarodii, formed the 18th Satrapy of the Achaemenian realm; Herodotus 3.94; *infra* n.33. The land of Syspirtis or Sper (Ispir) on the Armeno-Georgian confines was the last homeland of the Saspeires (also: Sapeires, Sabiri, Esperitae); Toumanoff, 'The Early Bagratids: Remarks in Connexion with Some Recent Publications,' *Le Muséon* 62 (1949) 24.

<sup>27</sup> The root of the first ethnicon is K-D; of the second, Č-N/S-N/H-N. The former can belong to the group of ethnic names known from the Karda(ka) of a Babylonian monument of the third millennium B.C. to the modern Kurds, together with the Guti, the Qurti (Cyrtii), and possibly the proto-Ḫattian Cataonians; E. Speiser, *Mesopotamian Origins* (Philadelphia 1930) 110-119; G. Driver, 'The Name Kurd in its Philological Connexions,' *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society* 1923.393-403; M. Tseretheli, 'The Asianic (Asia Minor) Elements in National Georgian Paganism,' *Georgica* 1.1 (1935) 37 n.5. More particularly, the K'art'vels have been identified with the Carduchi of Xenophon (*Anab.* 3.5; 4.1, 2, 3, 4; 5.5) and thus held to have originated in Gordyene, while their name may be related to that of the chief god of the Urat'ians, Ḫaldi; Lehmann-Haupt, 'On the Origin of the Georgians,' *Georgica* 3-4 (1937) (he denies any kinship between the Carduchi and the Kurds); V. Xudadov, 'Xaldy-Urat'ijcy posle padenija Vanskogo carstva,' *Vestnik Drevnej Istorii* 1938/2.3.122; A. Baschmakoff, *La Synthèse des Périples pontiques* (Paris 1948) 37; Adontz, *Armenija* 398. The ethnicon of the Suans is traced back by specialists to the second element of the biblical name of Tubalcain (Gen. 4.22) as denoting a group closely related to the Tabalians; it appears at any rate in the sixth and following centuries as the Sanni, the Heniochi, and as the second element in the Mossynoeci, of Hecataeus, fr. 191, 192; Scylax, *Per.* 76, 86; Herodotus, 3.94; 7.78; Xenophon, *Anab.* 5.4,5. The last two ethnica are, of course, rendered into Greek paronomastically. The name of Ḫaysa and the Armenian word *Hay* ('Armenian') are likewise derived from this root; Marr, *Izbr. raboty* 105, 115; *infra* n. 114.

of Caucasia resulted in the formation of the Georgian nation.<sup>28</sup> The Causasian Albanians, who dwelt in the eastern, Caspian moiety of the Isthmus and who early in the Middle Ages became Armenianized and in part also Georgianized and who, then, lost their identity through submersion by Islam, were unquestionably the result of a similar ethnogeny.<sup>29</sup>

The earliest polity produced by this Anatolian infiltration of Caucasia was the West Georgian kingdom of Colchis, which in the course of the eighth century had to withstand the attacks of King Sarduri II of Urartu. At the same time, Colchis represented the survival of an anterior cultural and political tradition, upon which that of the Kashkians was subsequently grafted. That tradition went back to the Bronze- and Copper-Age civilizations of Caucasia of the third-second millennium B.C.; and it is to that earlier, pre-Colchian, kingdom that, albeit under the later name, the myth of the Argonauts must refer.

4. Of all the Caucasian peoples of Antiquity, the Armenians alone belong to the Indo-European linguistic family. The languages of the rest are neither Indo-European nor Semitic, and Armenian itself shows in fact a vast non-Indo-European substratum. The organic unity of the Caucasian languages, including this substratum, has been recognized. Furthermore, their affinity to some or all of three language groups on the ancient Eastern Mediterranean — the Aegean-Anatolian, the Urartian-Ḫurrian-Elamite, and the Sumerian — is now admitted by a number of specialists, though denied, usually in part, by others. Some of those who admit this unity and these affinities would see in them not only a linguistic, but also an ethnic kinship by postulating the existence of one distinct ethnic group, pre-Indo-European and pre-Semitic, which is regarded, accordingly, as the 'third' and earliest civilized stratum in the entire Mediterranean world or at least of its eastern moiety.<sup>30</sup> At any rate, the religion and culture of the Urartians, of the pre-Christian Armenians and the pre-Christian Georgians were marked by palpable Anatolian and Mesopotamian affinities.<sup>31</sup>

<sup>28</sup> The ethnogenetic process of the Georgians has left traces in the linguistic division as still prevalent among them. The following are the languages spoken by the Georgians: (1) Georgian or K'art'velian (K-D) — the historical and literary language of all the Georgians; (2) Mingrelian (B-L; *infra* n. 114); (3) Lazian or Čanian (Č-N/S-N/H-N); (4) Suanian (S-N); (5) Abkhazian (M-S; *infra* b. 114); Marr and M. Brière, *La Langue géorgienne* (Paris 1931) viii-ix.

<sup>29</sup> For the Albanians, see *infra* nn. 33, 114.

<sup>30</sup> See *infra*, Supplementary Note A.

<sup>31</sup> In the religion of the proto-Caucasians and the pre-Christian Armenians and Georgians one observes an amalgam of Anatolian, Ḫurrian, Sumero-Akkadian, and even Aegean elements or of their equivalents — celestial and chthonian deities, gods of vegetation and fertility, the Great Mother, ancestor worship, 'divine kingship pattern,' temple-states; cf.

5. Before the old and the new ethnic elements had become definitively amalgamated in Caucasia, a new page was turned in the history of empires. By the year 550 B.C., the Median Monarchy had been superseded by, and absorbed into, the greatest political structure then yet known, the Iranian empire of the Achaemenids, in which all the imperial traditions of the ancient Near East had converged. Caucasia was now a part of this polity and began to participate in the cultural and religious aspects of the *pax achaemenia*, in 'Iranianism.' The Achaemenid administrative system accepted the fact of its division and continued the Median policy of favoring the proto-Armenian section of it. It is at this time that the word 'Armenia' first appears in the Iranian and Greek sources<sup>32</sup> in reference precisely to that section: a mere fraction of old Urartu, occupying the valleys of the Arsanias, the Euphrates, the Tigris, and stretching towards the upper Araxes; whereas the unconquered Urartians and other proto-Caucasians, as well as the proto-Georgian newcomers, are known to the contemporaries by a variety of names. Armenia was, thus, a separate satrapy in the lists of Darius I and of Xerxes, and in that of Herodotus; the others were, according to the last-named document, included in several other satrapies; while the Albanians appear as subjects of the Great

---

Adontz, *Hist. d'Arm.* 222-230, 247-254, 381-394 (= 'Les vestiges d'un ancien culte en Arménie'; extrait de l'*Annuaire de l'Institut de Philologie et d'Histoire orientales et slaves* 4 [= *Mélanges Franz Cumont*] Brussels 1936); Lap'anc'yan, *Xajasa* 84-98; *Maloazijskie (Azianičeskie) bogi u Armjan (Istoriko-lingv. raboty)*; Tseretheli, *Elements*; O. v. Wesendonk, 'Über georgisches Heidentum,' *Caucasica* 1 (1924); Toumanoff, 'A Note on the Orontids,' *Le Muséon* 72 (1959) I § 14-15; *infra* nn. 18, 55, 81, 111, 120. — For the importance of Urartian architecture, see Herzfeld, *Arch. Hist. Iran* (cf. Note A) 14-17, 35-36. 'Armenia... with its prodigious wealth of metals and its central position between the lands of old oriental history and Asia Minor, the Balkans, the Caucasus, and South Russia, must be regarded as the true home of aeneolithic metallurgy. The farther back in history, the greater becomes the importance of this almost unexplored country,'; *ibid.* 1-2 (the author would include Armenia in Western Iran).

<sup>32</sup> *Ἀρμένιοι*: Hecataeus (c. 550 B.C.) fr. 203 (195); *Armina* in Old Persian, *Harminuya* in Elamite, but *Uraštu* in Babylonian: the Bisutūn Inscription § 6, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30 (520/519 B.C.); the Persepolis Inscription e § 2 (516/509 B.C.); the Naqš-i-Rustam Inscription a § 3 (516/485 B.C.); the Daiva Inscription (486/465 B.C.); cf. F. H. Weissbach, *Die Keilinschriften der Achämeniden* (Leipzig 1911) 10, 30-32, 34-35, 36-37, 82, 88-89; R. G. Kent, 'The Daiva-Inscription of Xerxes,' *Language* 13/4 (1937). The ethnonim is *arminiya* in Old Persian; *har-mi-nu-ya-ir-ra* in Elamite; *u-ra-aš-ša-a-a* in Babylonian; Weissbach 30-34, 54, 60-61; cf. 138-139. — For the dating of these Achaemenian inscriptions, see M. Ehtéham, *L'Iran sous les Achéménides* (Fribourg 1946) 152-155, 156, 163-165. For the name itself, see Adontz, *Hist. d'Arm.* 322-329. The origin of the name is still a matter of some uncertainty (*infra* n. 114) and its appearance is subsequent to the appearance of the proto-Armenians. It was indeed at first applied precisely to them, but its traditional use has of course been to designate the nation that resulted from the fusion of these with the Urartians; it is in the latter sense that 'Armenian' is used here (*supra* n. 21).



King only at the very end of the Achaemenian period.<sup>33</sup> An exceptional position in this period was enjoyed by Colchis, which as a vassal State of the empire escaped satrapal control.<sup>34</sup> Culturally, too, Colchis presented an exception. It anticipated the future, for, while sharing to some extent in the political and cultural life of the Iranian empire, it underwent a definite Hellenic influence, with the formation, already in the eighth century B.C. and thereafter, of Greek colonies along the Euxine coast; to this influence the Colchian coinage from the sixth century on bears eloquent witness.<sup>35</sup> Finally, Colchis appears as the first Caucasian State to have achieved the coalescence of the newcomer and the autochthon; so that, whatever the subsequent, additional migrations, Colchis can be justly regarded as not a proto-Georgian, but a Georgian (West-Georgian) kingdom. The process of ethnic amalgamation, however, was not confined to it, but went on in Armenia as well. The land that the Ten Thousand knew in 401 B.C. had expanded, chiefly north-westwards, beyond the Euphrates and beyond the frontiers known to Herodotus; and besides the Satrapy of Armenia, there was now also the province of West Armenia governed by a vice-satrap.<sup>36</sup>

The events which had led to the collapse of the imperial structure of the Kings of Van and to the rise of the much vaster structure of the Kings of Anshan left Caucasia in a state of chaos. There is a great meagreness of source material

---

<sup>33</sup> Armina was the 11th Satrapy on the Bisutūn list, 7th on the Persepolis list, 19th on the Naqš-i-Rustam list, and 4th on that of the Daiva Inscription. According to Herodotus, the Armenii and the Pactyes formed together the 13th Satrapy (3.93); the 18th included the Uraṭian and Ḥurrian remnants: the Matieni, the Sapeires, and the Alarodii (3.94); the 19th, the proto-Georgian Moschi, Tibareni, Macrones, Mossynoeci, and Mares (*ibid.*); and the 11th, other proto-Caucasian peoples, like the Caspii (3.92). For the different lists of the Achaemenid provinces, see Ehtéham, *Iran Achém.* 121-184. The Moschi may be identical with the people called in Old Persian *Mačiyā*, in Elamite *Maššiya*, and in Babylonian *Mašu*, appearing in the Naqš-i-Rustam list, especially as they precede the *Karkā* (*Kurqa*, *Karsa*), who can only have been the Colchians; cf. Weissbach, *Keilinschriften* 88-89. The inclusion of the proto-Georgians in the empire must have taken place under Darius I (e.g., Cavaignac, *Monde méd.* 455); along with them, some proto-Caucasians of the Isthmus must also have been included in it, for Herodotus, 3.97, speaks of the Caucasus as the northern boundary of the Achaemenid State. — The Albanians are mentioned as vassals of the Achaemenids in Arrian 3.11.4; they seem to have been referred to as *Ἀγίανοί* by Ps. Apollodorus; Markwart, *Eranšahr nach der Geographie des Ps. Moses Xorenac'i* (Berlin 1901) 116-199; cf. Andreas, 'Albania,' RE 1/1.1303-1305; Tomaschek, 'Albanoi,' *ibid.* 1305-1306; *infra* n. 114. — The Achaemenid imposts bear witness to the prosperity and populousness of Caucasia at that time; Cavaignac 421-425.

<sup>34</sup> Colchis is not found in the list of the vassal States in Ehtéham, *Iran Achém.* 117-120; but see Herodotus 3.97, *supra* n. 33.

<sup>35</sup> Cf. D. Kapanaje, *Gruzinskaja numizmatika* (Moscow 1955) 31-35; D. Lang, *Studies in the Numismatic History of Georgia in Transcaucasia* (New York 1955) 6-9.

<sup>36</sup> Ehtéham, *Iran Achém.* 170, 175.

for its political and social development in the Achaemenian period.<sup>37</sup> What indications there are, however, all point to the continued existence of the dynastic aristocracy in Caucasia, but are silent as to that of any feudalistic features. Dynasticism was the basic element, and the latter features owed their existence to an introduction by the super-dynastic Crown, now temporarily in abeyance in Caucasia. For the proto-Armenians, Xenophon is our principal source, and the combined evidence of the *Anabasis* and the *Cyropaedia* shows them in the Heroic Age of a conquering nation. Three factors of their social organization are revealed to us. First, the still-patriarchal group, apparently not yet a fully evolved class, of clan-heads ruling over fortified rural settlements, whom Xenophon designates by the terms *κωμάρχης* and *ἀρχων τῆς κώμης*, an obvious equivalent of the Iranian *viθapaitiš*.<sup>38</sup> Second, the already crystallized higher, dynastic rung of the social hierarchy, the hereditary chiefs of the people-state, denoted by Xenophon by the term *βασιλεύς*.<sup>39</sup> And third, the free warriors who seem to represent the entire people, so that it must be supposed that the conquerors formed a class of warriors-farmers superimposed upon the subjugated aborigenes.<sup>40</sup> As for the other Caucasians, Xenophon has practically nothing to tell about their social structure. It is rather unthinkable that the highly developed social and political forms of the Urartian empire should have been completely obliterated during the period of chaos. The fact that, in the Arsacid and subsequent periods, so many princely houses of Armenia were to show definite traces of Urartian and generally pre-Armenian

<sup>37</sup> Cf. Manandyan, *Probl. ob. stroja* 15.

<sup>38</sup> *Anab.* 4.5-6. For the equivalence with the *viθapaitiš*, see Adontz, *Aspect* 140; for the latter term, Ehtésham, *Iran Achém.* 18-26, 40, 110-111. Cf. also Manandyan, *O torgovle* 18-19; *Probl. ob. stroja* 15-17.

<sup>39</sup> The *Cyropaedia*, a romance indeed, but one woven with threads of history, contains references to a King of the Armenians (i.e., proto-Armenians), who was an ally of Cyrus the Great, and to his two sons, Tigranes and Sabaris, as well as his struggle with the Chaldeans ('Chaldaeans'; cf. *supra* n. 22); *Cyrop.* 2.4; 3.1, 2, 3 — the title of king is used only in 3.1.3, 4; — Tigranes is also mentioned in 4.2.3; 5.1, 3; 6.1; 8.3, 4. It is in *Cyrop.*, 8.7.11, that we learn of (proto-)Armenia's passing under satrapal control only shortly before the death of Cyrus the Great (529 B.C.). The Armenian historical tradition preserved in Ps. Moses, *Hist. Arm.* 1.22-31 (cf. *infra* n. 123), knows of King Tigran, an ally of Cyrus. The evidence of the *Cyrop.* is discussed by Adontz in *Hist. d'Arm.* 331-344. For the sociological implication of this evidence, see Manandyan, *O torgovle* 43-44; *Probl. ob. stroja* 16-17. In the proto-Armenians, Dādaršiš, Darius I's general, and Arahū, the false Nabuchodonosor, Manandyan would see dynasts; *ibid.*; *O torgovle* 43.

<sup>40</sup> This is the conclusion reached by Manandyan chiefly on the basis of the high number of the proto-Armenian auxiliaries in the Iranian armed forces, as given by the *Cyrop.* The proto-Armenians, thus, appear as a free armed people; *O torgovle* 43-45; *Probl. ob. stroja*. For the Iranian parallel, see Adontz, *Armenija* 378-383; Manandyan, *Zametki o feode i feodal'nom vojske Parfii i Aršakidskoj Armenii* (Tiflis 1932).



origin lends support to this view.<sup>41</sup> The proto-Georgians may indeed have in part experienced a social and political decline in connection with their migration from Anatolia to the Pontic and Caucasian regions, yet Xenophon happens to indicate that among them, at least among one proto-Georgian people, the Mossynoecians, there flourished the dynastic group of the βασιλεῖς and ἄρχοντες.<sup>42</sup> It is clear, then, that the inclusion of Caucasia in the Iranian Empire and the consequent introduction there of the satrapal administration did not imply the disappearance of the dynastic aristocracy.<sup>43</sup>

6. With Alexander the Great a new era began. His conquests effected the superseding of the Achaemenid by the Macedonian peace and brought Hellenic cultural influence to mold the entire East Mediterranean world, and even lands beyond its frontiers. Yet, it must be borne in mind that in the world of Hellenism that had thus come into existence, the vestiges of the earlier world of 'Iranianism' were not effaced, especially in those areas which, like Caucasia, Pontus, Cappadocia, or indeed Iran itself, had been profoundly affected by the other. For Caucasia all this was of incalculable importance. An inner polarity was as a result introduced in the cultural and political aspects of existence which left a lasting imprint upon its history. Like Iran after Alexander, Caucasia was vibrant with the tension between two cultural traditions, the Iranian — itself a synthesis of the earlier cultures of Hither Asia — and the Greek, which the dynastic aristocracy was eager to adopt and to spread while

<sup>41</sup> *Infra* at nn. 187, 188, 190, 191, 192; Tourmanoff, 'Some Aspects of Caucasian Social History, A: Lists of the Armenian Princes,' to appear in *Le Muséon*.

<sup>42</sup> *Anab.* 5.4.26; cf. 5.4.15 and 5.4.3, 4, 8.

<sup>43</sup> Cf. Adontz, *Armenija* 390 n.1; *Hist. d'Arm.* 332-344; Manandyan, *O torgovle* 43; *Probl. ob. stroja* 16-17. — It is to be noted in this connexion that some of the assumptions of Adontz, in *Armenija*, especially 371-426, and in *Aspect* cannot be readily accepted. (1) He appears to assume that Xenophon told *all* there was to be told about the social structure of proto-Armenia. In actual fact, of course, Xenophon had no intention of describing the social conditions of that country; and the experience of the Ten Thousand was, after all, of necessity a limited one. On their march through what could only be narrow sections, strips really, of proto-Armenia, they came upon not more than three or four rural settlements (κώμαι). These indeed appear to have been still in tribal conditions; but there is nothing in this to negate the existence of bigger dynasts, already emancipated from the tribal ways, to whom Xenophon does refer elsewhere (*supra* n. 39) and whom the passing Greeks may simply not have happened to meet. — (2) Adontz seems to refer, as a matter of course, this information of the *Anab.* to *all* of the territory of future Armenia, i.e., inclusive of the Urartians and other proto-Caucasians who only subsequently became parts of Armenia, but who at that time were outside the proto-Armenian federation. The sociological level of these must of necessity have been more advanced than that of the proto-Armenians, weakened as it was by the Thraco-Phrygian admixture. (3) He assumes that the Armenian social development was part and parcel of the Iranian: this is to overlook completely the role of the Hayasa, let alone that of the surviving Urartians and other proto-Caucasians.

cleaving to the other. The Armenian and Georgian rulers of subsequent centuries who struck coins of the Hellenistic type or had their effigies intagliated in the Sassanian style, and who displayed thereon their Iranian attire while their Iranoid names and titles were proclaimed by Greek legends, offer one example of this dualism. But a more celebrated, and dramatic, example is surely Plutarch's account of how the news of the destruction of Crassus and his army was brought to the Court of Armenia, in May 53 B.C., during the performance of Euripides' *Bacchae* at the wedding of a prince of Parthia and a sister of King Artavasdes II of Armenia; the latter, by the way, was himself a noted Greek tragedian and historian.<sup>44</sup> This cultural tension was a constructive one. But it was paralleled by another, a political polarity which tended to be destructive. For, after Rome's advent to the Eastern Mediterranean in entering upon Alexander's inheritance, and after Iran's withdrawal from the world of Hellenism, the Caucasian States were perpetually subjected to two rival aggressions, from the east and from the west, and were constrained perpetually to waver between Iran, on the one hand, and Rome and, then, Byzantium, on the other.

The immediate effects of the change wrought by Alexander were also of no small moment for Caucasia, economically, socially, and politically. The exclusively agricultural economy and rural existence of Achaemenian Caucasia — money made its appearance there only at the end of the Achaemenian period — were rather suddenly altered. Caucasia, and especially Armenia, found itself in close proximity to a number of Hellenistic countries and thus open to new influences, both cultural and economic. An important overland route of transit trade, connecting China, India, and Central Asia with the Mediterranean world, passed through Armenia and Colchis, and also through Iberia and, possibly, Albania; great cities arose along that route — Armarwir, Artaxata, Phasis — which were at the same time homes of foreign merchants and centres of diffusion of Hellenism.<sup>45</sup> A money economy made, thus, quite forcefully its appearance. This speeding up of the economic development brought about the disintegration of Caucasia's tribal-patriarchal society at its non-dynastic levels. Exactly as the passing from the tribe to the people-state, on the one hand, and the conditions of the Heroic Age, on the other, had eman-

<sup>44</sup> Plutarch, *Crassus* 33. — For the historic performance of the *Bacchae*, see G. Goyan, 'Čerty svoeobrazija armjanskogo ėllinističeskogo teatra,' *Vestnik Drevnej Istorii* 1950/3 (33) 178-183.

<sup>45</sup> Manandyan discusses at some length the various theories about the position of this trade route; *O trgovle* 53-62. The network of trade routes in Caucasia is analyzed *ibid.* 126-168 and by Markwart, *Skizzen zur historischen Topographie und Geschichte von Kaukasien* (Vienna 1928). For Armenia's Hellenism, trade, metal industry and toreutic art, see also M. Rostovtzeff, *The Social and Economic History of the Hellenistic World* (Oxford 1941) 856, 576, 586, 540, 376.

cipated the dynastic group from the tribal ways and helped its crystallization as a social class, so now the new economic and cultural factors spelt the freeing of the lower social layers from these ways and the crystallization of new social stratifications among them.

Politically, too, the Hellenistic Age introduced changes in Armenia and Georgia. The Iranian empire had fallen, and whatever Macedonian control was substituted for it in Caucasia was so tenuous as to allow a flourishing of local monarchical institutions. Armenia retained in the new age its old division into the eastern and the western realm. The former — the Satrapy of Armenia — always the more important, had meantime grown vaster through the acquisition of more Urartian territory north and east of the original proto-Armenian nucleus, notably the valley of the Araxes, and was now known as Greater Armenia, whilst the trans-Euphratensian western country became Lesser Armenia. There were, moreover, several still-Urartian regions on the Armenian Plateau, north-east and east of Greater Armenia, but of them practically nothing is known to us. Very little is also known of the history of the Kingdom of Lesser Armenia which, after a period of Seleucid overlordship, ended with its absorption by the expanding Kingdom of Pontus and its passing from the orbit of Caucasia. Quite different is the case of Greater Armenia, whose history is comparatively well established. Already in the Achaemenian phase, the office of Satrap of Armenia became hereditary in the Iranian families of the Hydarnids and, then, the Orontids. The latter claimed Hydarnid descent and were, moreover, related through marriage to the Achaemenids. Orontid rule in Armenia was grounded in the ascendancy that the satrapal position of the dynasty and its expansion over the remaining Urartian lands secured for it with regard to the local dynasts, and, in the Hellenistic phase, also in the control it exercised over the great Armenian centres of international trade. The collapse of the Iranian empire and the advent of Alexander the Great set Orontid Armenia free of foreign domination. The fact that the Orontids were descended from the Achaemenid Great Kings, who were no more, and that they held sway over most of the territory of the old Vannic Monarchy, when conjoined with their power and their *de facto* autonomy, led them to assume the status of kings. Thus the First Armenian Kingdom (as we may call it) was founded; it was to be eclipsed by the Artaxiad Monarchy that succeeded it, and thus forgotten by History until its rediscovery today. The Orontid Monarchy was never conquered by Alexander, but was nominally included first in his empire, and then, after a period of complete independence in the years 323-301 B.C., in the empire of his Seleucid successors.

The Orontid kings chafed under Seleucid suzerainty. And so, about 212 B.C., the energetic Antiochus III had to resort to a military expedition in order to bring King Xerxes of Armenia to obedience. Sometime later, about 200

B.C., the latter's successor, Orontes IV, was faced with a revolt of Artaxias, who appears to have been a local dynast.<sup>46</sup> It is not beyond possibility that Antiochus III had his hand in this, perhaps in order to vitiate another attempt to shake off Seleucid overlordship. He, at any rate, endeavored to profit by it, as will be seen presently. Having overthrown Orontes, Artaxias possessed himself of most of Greater Armenia, but not of the entire kingdom, because a scion of the old dynasty, named Zariadris, established himself in the south-western Armenian province of Sophene (ancient Ishuwa). That land, situated between the Tigris and the Euphrates, south of the Arsianias and extending southwards beyond the Anti-Taurus, and so beyond the south-western bastion of the Armenian Plateau, had been the Hittite frontier of the Vannic Monarchy and now was the most Hellenized of the Armenian provinces. Both Artaxias and Zariadris became Seleucid governors in their respective realms, as Antiochus III evidently attempted to apply a *divide et impera* policy to a vassal kingdom that had proved insubordinate. This weakening division of Armenia must account for the Seleucid non-recognition of the royal dignity of either rival.<sup>47</sup> All this was in the end a miscalculation. No sooner had Antiochus sustained, at Magnesia in 190 B.C., his great defeat at the hands of the Romans than both Artaxias and Zariadris seceded from the Seleucid Monarchy. In the Peace of Apamea of 188, which sealed the Roman victory, the status of independent kings was acquired by both under the guarantee of the Roman Senate. This was the first juridical contact of Armenia and Rome. The two kingdoms, Greater Armenia and Sophene, pursued thereafter a lively expansionary policy, undeterred by the momentary return of Seleucid suzerainty under Antiochus IV. They proceeded to absorb more of the neighboring territories till the boundaries of historical Armenia were reached by the two together. Consequent on this near-unification was the growing linguistic homogeneity of the country.

---

<sup>46</sup> The Artaxiad house showed a predilection for the name of Tigranes, and this may indicate Artaxias I's descent from, or at least a connexion with, the proto-Armenian Tigranids (Adontz, *Armenija* 390 n. 1 and 389-390, where the Artaxiads are simply called 'Tigranids'), who must have been not a little reduced when the proto-Armenians were placed in 529 B.C. under a satrap; cf. *supra* n.39. It is worth noting that 'Artaxias' renders the purely Armenian form (*Artašēs*) of the name, of which the Iranian form, *Artaxšātra*, is customarily given in Greek as 'Artaxerxes'; H. Hübschmann, *Armenische Grammatik* (Leipzig 1895) 28-29, 505; for a different opinion, not accepted by Hübschmann, see F. Justi, *Iranisches Namenbuch* (Marburg 1895) 36-37, cf. 34-36. The King Assuerus of the Book of Esther is called *Artašēs* in the Armenian Bible. — The revolt of Artaxias suggests a dynastic as well as a nationalistic enmity towards the Iranian and satrapal Orontids.

<sup>47</sup> For the Orontid dynasty and the above summary of the history of the First Armenian Kingdom, which bridged the gap between the Achaemenian phase and the Second Kingdom of the Artaxiads, see my *Orontids*. — Our sources for Lesser Armenia and its dynasts are: Strabo 12.3.28; Polybius 25.2; cf. 8.25; cf. also Reinach, *Mithridate* 78-79; Adontz, *Armenija* 66-90.

7. The Second Armenian Kingdom, under the House of Artaxias, revived the glories of Urartu and, briefly, even surpassed them. Under the Artaxiad King Tigranes II the Great (95-56 B.C.), Greater Armenia was further enlarged, through the annexation of neighboring territories, not the least of which, from the point of view of Armenian unity, was the short-lived Kingdom of Sophene.<sup>48</sup> Then, while the decadent Seleucids were struggling with Rome over the inheritance of Alexander, and, over the inheritance of Cyrus and Darius, with the newly-risen Parthian Arsacids, Tigranes II embarked upon an empire-building effort of his own. One by one, the outlying kingdoms accepted his overlordship — Iberia, Albania, Atropatene, Gordyene, Adiabene, Mygdonia, Osroene, and Commagene.<sup>49</sup> Finally, in 84 B.C., Tigranes conquered the Seleucid throne. His empire thus stretched from the Caucasus to Palestine and from Cappadocia to Parthia; and his new capital, Tigranocerta ‘contrôlait la grande route de commerce qui, partie d’Antioche, filait par Zeugma, Edesse, Nisibe et Arbèles vers Ecbatane et Hécatompylos chez les Parthes, pour gagner la Bactriane et l’Inde.’<sup>50</sup> Prosperity and, so long as it lasted, peace crowned his victories. But, as heir of the Seleucids and as ally and son-in-law of Mithridates Eupator of Pontus, Tigranes became involved in the great struggle between the Hellenistic East and Rome which then convulsed the Eastern Mediterranean; he ended by suffering a defeat at the hands of Lucullus and, later, of Pompey. By 66 B.C., the empire of Tigranes the Great had vanished and his own Armenian Monarchy had had ‘Roman friendship’ imposed upon it — the second juridical contact. But the unity and, more than that, the imperial tradition of Great Armenia, as a successor of Urartu, remained.<sup>51</sup>

<sup>48</sup> The last Orontid, Orontes (Artanes) V, perished in the struggle, but his dynasty survived in several princely houses of Armenia and in the royal house of Commagene; cf. my *Orontids* I.2, 3, 4, 11-16; II; *infra* at nn. 181, 194.

<sup>49</sup> Iberia was ruled by a branch of the Artaxiads (*infra* n.68) and Commagene by a branch of the Orontids; *supra* n. 48.

<sup>50</sup> Grousset, *Histoire* 89. — The capitals of Armenia were: Armawir of the Orontids (Manandyan, *O torgovle* 37) until Orontes IV transferred his residence to Eruandašat (= \*Orontaxata), while Armawir remained the holy city (*ibid.* 38-39); then Artaxata or Artašat, founded by Artaxias I (*ibid.* 48-53, 109; Manandyan, *Tigran Vtoroj i Rim* [Erivan 1943] 20-21); and finally, Tigranocerta (\*Tigranakert), later called Neronia; *Tigran* 56; *O torgovle* 71-79; Lehmann-Haupt, ‘Tigranokerta,’ RE 6A/1.981-1007. In Sophene, Arsamosata appears to have been built while the Orontids were kings in undivided Greater Armenia (cf. *Orontids* I.2, 5), so that the capital of the separate Sophenian kingdom could only have been Carthiocrta or Arcathiocrta; cf. Manandyan, *O torgovle* 32-35; *Tigran* 61; Markwart, *Südarmenien und die Tigrisquellen* (Vienna 1930) 33-38, 68 n.1 (69).

<sup>51</sup> The Armenian historical tradition is aware of no break between the Vannic and the Armenian Monarchy and takes for granted the Urartian heritage. The Orontid First Armenian Kingdom explains this continuity. Thus, Aram (c. 880-844 B.C.), the founder of the em-

With the disappearance of the Seleucid and other Macedonian succession States, the inheritance of Alexander in the Eastern Mediterranean was disputed by two outsiders, Arsacid Iran (Parthia) and Rome. Armenia was one of the disputed territories, and doubly so, both as a part of that inheritance and as a vassal, on the one hand, of the Achaemenids, to whose succession the Arsacids laid claims, and, on the other, of the Roman State. In the course of the struggle, begun by the latter in 54 B.C., the Artaxiad Dynasty came to extinction at the beginning of the first century,<sup>52</sup> and the throne of Armenia fell prey to a series of foreign contestants, Median, Judaeon, Iranian, Pontic, and Iberian princes, whose conflicting interests were supported by the two opposing imperial neighbours and by different political factions inside the kingdom. At last, however, a *modus vivendi* was reached by the empires. In the Peace of Rhandaia of A.D. 63, it was agreed that an Arsacid cadet should reign in Armenia, but as a vassal of Caesar. In 66, the Arsacid Tiridates I, who had earlier claimed the throne of Armenia, made his celebrated journey to Rome, to receive amid much pomp his investiture from the hands of Nero. The Third Armenian Kingdom was thus founded. The settlement of Rhandaia

---

pire of Urartu is regarded by that tradition as one of the royal successors of Hayk, the eponym of the Armenians; *Prim. Hist. Arm.* (for which, see *infra* n. 113: *apud* Sebēos, *Hist. Heracl.*; ed. Tiflis 1912) 3, 7; Ps. Moses 1.5, 12, 13, 14, 19; cf. *infra* n. 114. Ps. Moses also refers (1.12) to the derivation of the non-Armenian term 'Armenia' from the same Aram. — For the imperial title of Tigranes and his successors, see *infra* n. 53. 'Greater Armenia' has here rendered *μεγάλη Ἀρμενία* = *Armenia maior* of the Graeco-Latin sources, as used in contradistinction to *μικρὰ Ἀρμενία* = *Armenia minor*. On the other hand, 'Great Armenia' is used herein to render the terminology of the national historical tradition, which, because Lesser Armenia had long passed outside the Armenian political sphere, and, no doubt, also under the influence of the imperial tradition, acquired an absolute sense, comparable to that of 'Great Britain.' Cf. the fifth-century historian, Faustus of Buzanda, *Hist. Arm.* 3.3 (ed. Venice 1933, 20): *mecin Hayoc' liknojn*; 3.8 (29): *ašxarhin Hayoc' mecac'*; *ibid.* (31): *zōravarn Hayoc' mecac'*; 3.10 (36): *kat'olikosin Hayoc' mecac'*, etc. (lit. 'Great Armenians'). — The latest study on Tigranes the Great is Manandyan's monograph, *Tigran*, in many respects a most excellent work. Very important is the author's contribution towards clearing the great king's reputation from a certain stigma which modern historiography inherited from the Roman war propaganda. For this, see also Grousset, *Histoire* 84-100 (and, for a similar task, Sir W. W. Tarn's chivalrous treatment of Cleopatra in *CAH* 10, chaps. 2, 3).

<sup>52</sup> The last Artaxiad sovereign was Queen Erato, who was definitively dethroned — for the second time — c. A.D. 14 (P. Asdourian, *Die politischen Beziehungen zwischen Armenien und Rom* [Venice 1911] 69-72, 78) or earlier (N. Debevoise, *A Political History of Parthia* [Chicago 1938] 147-148); cf. Stein, 'Erato,' *RE* 6/1. 355-356 (No. 9). — The Armenian historical tradition, as found in the *Prim. Hist. Arm.* 15-16 and Ps. Moses 1.8; 2.2; 3ff., commits the curious error of regarding the Artaxiads as one continuous dynasty with the Arsacids, who began to reign in Armenia in the first century of our era, and thus of referring to them as also Arsacids; *infra* at n. 126. For the history of Armenia under the Artaxiads and their successors, see also Debevoise, *op. cit.* 121-202; D. Magie, *Roman Rule in Asia Minor* (Princeton 1950) *passim*.



signified an important solution in principle of the Armenian problem. It was not, however, successfully put into practice for any length of time. The struggle of empires, accordingly, flared up anew. In the years 115-116, Armenia was even annexed to the Roman Empire by Trajan. Nevertheless, by 217 Rome had been obliged to return to the principles of Rhandaia; and another Arsacid, Tiridates II, received the crown of Armenia from the Emperor Macrinus. Thereafter, that crown remained the unquestioned possession of the Arsacids, even after the imperial line of that dynasty had been replaced on the Iranian throne by the Sassanids. The Arsacid epoch was marked at first by a definite revival of 'Iranianism' in Armenia and in Caucasia, succeeding the Hellenism of the Artaxiad epoch. This revival, however, was soon counterbalanced by the consequences of the greatest event of the new epoch, the acceptance of Christianity by the Caucasian States.

8. The social and political organization of Great Armenia in the Artaxiad epoch was to some extent a replica of that of the Vannic Monarchy. Like it, the empire of Tigranes II was a federation of States, great and small, Armenian and foreign, held together by the ties of political subordination. Overlord of numerous kings, Tigranes bore, in imitation of the Iranian Emperors, the title of βασιλεὺς βασιλέων, which was also the exact equivalent of the Urartian *erili erilaue*, and, as with his Urartian predecessors, his was a theophanic kingship.<sup>53</sup> Moreover, the dynasts who accepted the superior authority of the King of Kings appear to have formed, as in Urartu, two groups: the tributaries and the vassals. The rulers of the kingdoms outside Armenia belonged, obviously, to the former category. At the same time, we hear of 'many kings' paying court to Tigranes and among them of four in particular who remained in constant attendance on him.<sup>54</sup> These, evidently, were not foreign monarchs

<sup>53</sup> The official title of Tigranes the Great and his successors was βασιλεὺς βασιλέων or μέγας βασιλεύς; cf. the numismatic evidence cited in Asdourian, *Arm. u. Rom* 51 n. 1, 52 n. 2, 68 n. 2, 69 n. 1, 77 n. 3. In the Garni stele, Tiridates III entitles his consort μεγάλη βασιλίσσα cf., e.g., Kherumian, in *Vostan* 1 (1948-1949) 278. Cf. also Plutarch, *Lucullus* 14.5; 21.7; Appian, *Syr.* 48; Dio Cassius 37.6. Alexander Helios, son of Marc Antony and Cleopatra, was made King of Kings of Parthia, Media, and Armenia (Plutarch, *Ant.* 54; Dio Cassius 49.41), and Marc Antony's coin struck to commemorate the conquest of Armenia in 34 B.C. has the legend: *Cleopatrae reginae regum filiorum regum*; Asdourian, *op. cit.* 64 n. 2. — For the equivalence of 'King of Kings' and 'Great King' and their religious significance, see Griffith, *Βασιλεὺς βασιλέων*; cf. also Jessen, *Basileus* 80-81. It is difficult to agree with E. Herzfeld that the title of Tigranes the Great signified 'the aspiration to the suzerainty over all Iran' (*Paikuli: Monument and Inscription of the Early History of the Sasanian Empire* I [Berlin 1924] 217); although it may have been assumed in imitation of the Iranian monarchs, it was not a title peculiar to Iran. For the theophanic character of the Armenian kings, see *infra* n. 120; for that of the Vannic kings, *supra* at n. 18.

<sup>54</sup> Plutarch, *Lucullus* 21.2, 5; Appian, *Syr.* 48; cf. Manandyan, *Tigran, passim*; *O torgovle* 66-69; *Probl. ob. stroja* 24. — The unfavorable Graeco-Roman sources caricature Tigranes



of the caliber of those of Atropatene or of Commagene, but, plainly, local and lesser Armenian dynasts. The reference to the four kings, as will be seen, leaves no doubt of this, and is, besides, an important witness to the continued existence of the Armenian dynastic aristocracy under the Artaxiad High King. These Armenian dynasts, and also temple-states of equally immemorial antiquity, formed thus the second group: the vassals.<sup>55</sup> As for the rest of Armenian society, the crystallization of its subdivisions at the non-dynastic levels in the Artaxiad epoch has already been noted, which may mean that, as in the Vannic empire, there was formed a body of the ordinary, non-sovereign *noblesse*.<sup>56</sup>

There are three points to be considered in connection with the social structure of Artaxiad Armenia, which may, by the way, indicate its continuance into the Armenia of the succeeding, Arsacid period. First, the four kings of Tigranes II survived well into that period and are frequently mentioned in Arsacid and subsequent monuments as the four vitaxae, or viceroys, of the four marches of the Great Armenian realm.<sup>57</sup> Second, there are onomastic and genealogical indications of this continuity in the case of a number of the Armenian princely houses of the Arsacid and following periods.<sup>58</sup> Third, one of Tigranes' princely vassals is called *στρατηγός* by Appian.<sup>59</sup> Now this word may have meant simply a general. On the other hand, it had acquired in the late Seleucid period a definite institutional significance. The Achaemenian and the Seleucid satrap tended to be a rather purely civil official, with the military affairs of the satrapy placed, in the Seleucid realm, occasionally in the hands of a strategus.<sup>60</sup> The latter, in the course of the third century B.C. and especially under Antiochus III, tended to replace the satrap altogether in the Seleucid empire and particularly in Asia Minor, becoming thus a military governor entrusted with some civil functions.<sup>61</sup> As a matter of fact, Artaxias of Greater Armenia and Za-

---

and the Achaemenian ceremonial of his Court; Manandyan, *Tigran* 58; cf. Grousset, *Histoire* 89. This caricature has been repeated to this day; cf., e.g., Magie, *Roman Rule* 338-340 etc.

<sup>55</sup> For the role of the Armenian military-landowning aristocracy, see Manandyan, *Tigran* 56; *O torgovle* 67-82; *Probl. ob. stroja* 22-25; cf. Grousset, *Histoire* 91. For the temple-states, the most celebrated of which was no doubt that of Anaitis in Acilisene (Strabo 11.14.16), see Rostovtzeff, *Soc. Econ. Hist.* 505-506; also cf. A. Carrière, *Les huit sanctuaires de l'Arménie payenne, d'après Agathange et Moïse de Khoren* (Paris 1899).

<sup>56</sup> On the similar development in Iberia, cf. *infra* at nn. 97-99. See also Rostovtzeff, *Soc. Econ. Hist.* 1157-1159 for the general social conditions in Hellenistic Armenia and other Hellenistic States of Asia Minor.

<sup>57</sup> Toumanoff, *Some Aspects of Caucasian Social History*, B: *The Caucasian Vitaxae*.

<sup>58</sup> *Infra* at nn. 187-197; Toumanoff, *Orontids; Lists*.

<sup>59</sup> *Syr.* 48.

<sup>60</sup> Ehtéham, *Iran Achém.* 113-115, 184; H. Bengtson, *Die Strategie in der hellenistischen Zeit* II (Munich 1944) 38-64; Lehmann-Haupt, 'Satrap,' *RE.* 2A/1.

<sup>61</sup> Bengtson, *Strategie*, esp. 90-193.

riadris of Sophene were Seleucid strategoi, not satraps.<sup>62</sup> And this office the Artaxiad Kings of Armenia appear to have borrowed, exactly as the other succession States of the Seleucid Monarchy borrowed it.<sup>63</sup> It could, in this connexion, be suggested that the institution of the four vitaxae was somewhat influenced by the pattern of the (three) Seleucid viceroys controlling the satraps and the strategoi.<sup>64</sup> What is interesting in the introduction of the offices of vitaxa and of strategus in Armenia is the testimony it bears to the appearance in the Artaxiad period, as in the Vannic, of feudalistic features in a dynasticist federation. These features manifest the tendency of the Crown — which was to become fully revealed in the Arsacid period — to enhance its control of the sub-kings by connecting their sovereign rights with some form of service to itself. Thus the words of the elder Pliny, which Professor Adontz interpreted as referring to the Arsacid period, may likewise apply also to the Armenia of the Artaxiads: — ‘dividitur [Armenia], quod certum est, in praefecturas, quas strategias vocant, quasdam ex his vel singula regna quondam, barbaris nominibus cxx.’<sup>65</sup> Whether this arrangement was consciously based by the Artaxiad house on the Vannic imperial pattern is impossible to ascertain; but there can be no doubt that both the memory of the Achaemenid empire and the example of those of the Seleucids and the Arsacids were largely responsible for it.<sup>66</sup> With the downfall of the multinational State of Tigranes the Great the tributary kings left for the most part the orbit of Great Armenia, but the local sub-kings, or princes, remained within it as the outstanding feature of the Armenian polity of the Arsacid and subsequent periods.

9. For the Georgians, the *translatio imperii* from the Iranians to the Macedonians was as momentous as it was for the Armenians. By that time, the Moschians, Tibarenians-Iberians, K’art’velians, and Suanians had established themselves in the basins of the Cyrus and the Acampsis — some Moschians and Iberians penetrating farther still, into Colchis, and the Suanians settling north-east of it, on the slopes of the Caucasus — and had begun mingling with

<sup>62</sup> Strabo 11.14.5, 15; cf. Bengtson, *Strategie* 409.

<sup>63</sup> Bengtson, *Strategie* 255-257, cf. 412; cf. Manandyan, *Tigran* 58; *O torgovle*.

<sup>64</sup> Bengtson, *Strategie* 78-142. This was an obvious equivalent of the Achaemenian institution of the toparch or *bēvarāpaitiš*, for which see Ehtéham, *Iran Achém.* 70-71, 114, 184.

<sup>65</sup> *Nat. hist.* 6.27. Cf. Adontz, *Armenija* 391-392, 433; and *infra* at nn. 207-208.

<sup>66</sup> The Japanese parallel once again (cf. *supra* n. 11) suggests itself. Both Caucasia and Japan were — to use the terminology of the authors of *Feud. in Hist.* (*supra* n. 2 ff.) — ‘ghost empires,’ i.e., ‘something which necessarily accompanies feudalism.’ Though formed through the projection of an ‘old empire’ upon tribal territory (thus the Han Empire of China and the Achaemenid Empire of Iran) each ‘ghost’ was in actual fact modelled on a ‘real and solid,’ and moreover contemporary, imperial formation which had succeeded the ‘old empire’ (the T’ang in one case, the Seleucid and Parthian in the other) and which occupied ‘the main part of the society’ (Far East, Near East) and was ‘an empire of different quality,’ i.e., one devoid of feudal features; cf. Coulborn, *Comp. Study of Feud.* esp. 246-247.

the Colchians and with the Hurrian and Urartian remnants and various other proto-Caucasians, such as the Saspeires, the Taochians, the Javakhians, as well as also with the Scythian and Cimmerian groups left over from the invasions of the eighth and the seventh century B.C. The destruction of the Achaemenid empire meant a relaxation of foreign control, for which the Macedonians did not provide in these regions an adequate replacement; and this newly acquired independence was one factor contributing to the formation, in the valley of the Cyrus, of another Georgian (East Georgian) kingdom — Iberia. The other contributive factor was the unification of the various East Georgian tribal dynasties under the leadership of one of them, the Pharnabazids: the house of the half-legendary traditional First King of Iberia, Pharnabazus, which claimed, like the other dynasties, descent from the divine eponym of the nation.<sup>67</sup> From the beginning of its existence, and no doubt as a consequence of the setting up of Seleucid overlordship in Armenia (301 B.C.), this Pharnabazid kingdom was a vassal of the Seleucid empire. Early on, this royal house became extinct and was followed by houses related to it in the female line, including a branch of the Armenian Artaxiads; and by the time of Tigranes the Great, Iberia had exchanged Seleucid for Artaxiad suzerainty.<sup>68</sup>

<sup>67</sup> The Georgian form of this Iranoid name, for which see Justi, *Namenbuch* 92; Hübschmann, *Grammatik* 89; *infra* n. 111, is *P'arnavaz*. The dynastic patronymic is *P'arnavazian*; Leontius of Ruisi (hereinafter: Leont. Mrov.; cf. *infra* n. 79), *Hist. of the Kings of Iberia* (ed. S. Qauxč'išvili, *K'art'lis C'xovreba* I [Tiflis 1955]) 7-66; cf. the P'ar[n]awazean of the Armenian historical tradition; *Prim. Hist. Arm.* 14; Faustus 5.15. *P'arnavaz-P'arnawaz* was incorporated into the royal theogonies of that tradition; *Prim. Hist. Arm.* 9. For the divine descent claimed by the Iberian dynasts, see *infra* at n. 81; for the royal theophany in Iberia, *infra* at n. 111.

<sup>68</sup> The Iberian historical tradition, as found in Leont. Mrov. and, to a lesser extent, in the *Convers. Iber.* with its appendages: the *Prim. Hist. Iber.*, the *Roy. List I*, the *Roy. List II* and the *Roy. List III* (cf. *infra* n. 79; ed. E. T'aqaišvili, in *Sbornik Materialov dlja opisaniia... Kavkaza* 41 [1910] 48-96 and 42 [1912] 1-57) provides a few synchronisms of value, on the basis of which an approximate chronology of early Iberian history can be established. For a recent attempt in this direction, see P. Ingoroqva, 'Jvel-k'art'uli matiane • Mok'c'eva K'art'liša • da antikuri xanis Iberiis mep'et'a sia,' *Sak'art'velos Sax. Muzeumis Moambe* 11 (1941) 294-299. — The male posterity of Pharnabazus became, according to that tradition, extinct with his son Sauromaces or Saurmag, and the throne passed to the latter's cousin by marriage, son-in-law, and adopted son Mirvan I. Mirvan was an Iranian and his family is known as the *Nebrofian* dynasty; Leont. Mrov. 27-30, 33-35, cf. 63. The name means 'the race of Nemrod,' by which the Iranians as a people were occasionally designated in early Georgian literature; cf. Leont. Mrov. 10, 12. This dynasty, which may be called 'Second Pharnabazid,' was momentarily replaced by a branch of the Armenian royal house, related to it in its turn through a woman: Mirvan I's daughter; Leont. Mrov. 28-30. The date of this event must lie somewhere in the middle of the second century B.C., when Armenia was under Artaxiad rule. The Iberian historical tradition indirectly, but unmistakably, supports this when it describes these Armenian Kings of Iberia as Arsacids (*Aršakun*; Leont.

While Iberia was part of the Artaxiad dynastic complex, the West Georgian State of Colchis shared the fate of Lesser Armenia in becoming, except for a brief moment of independence at the end of the first century B.C., included in the empire of Pontus. East of Iberia and oriented towards Iran and the Caspian, lay Albania, which first appeared as a kingdom among the vassals of Tigranes the Great. Together with Armenia, the three countries north of it became implicated in the Mithridatic wars and were made to feel the superior might of the Roman arms. After the defeat of Tigranes, King Oroizes of Albania submitted, in the Winter of 66 B.C., to Pompey and to Roman control; in the Spring of 65, King Artoces of Iberia was constrained to follow suit; and, in 64, Pompey set up a new king in Colchis, Aristarchus, a client, also, of Rome. These were the first Georgio-Albanian juridical contacts with Rome. Thus, in the years 66-64 B.C., the whole of Caucasia entered the orbit of the nascent *pax romana*.

In the second century, the extinction of the (female) Pharnabazids brought a branch of the Armenian Arsacids to the throne of Iberia. An Arsacid line was, apparently, established about the same time in Albania.<sup>69</sup> And so, except

---

Mrov. 33 etc.), for this is exactly how the Armenian historical tradition regards the Artaxiads (*supra* n. 52; *infra* at n. 126). Accordingly, the royal name of Arsaces (*Aršak*), borne by two Kings of Iberia — one of them Nemrodid, but son of an Artaxiad princess — (Leont. Mrov. 28-30, 33-35; *Roy. List I* 49 [*Arsok*, *Arsuk*]) and by a King of Armenia as given by Leont. Mrov. 28, is an obvious error for Artaxias (*Artasēs*), the King of Armenia in question being, clearly, Artaxias I. Finally, the momentarily restored Nemrodids were followed by the Third Pharnabazid dynasty, which is said to have been West Georgian by origin and descended from a sister of Pharnabazus and which had no other name than *P'arnavazian*; Leont. Mrov. 55-57. — Seleucid suzerainty over the early Iberian Monarchy is unequivocally admitted by Leont. Mrov. 23, 25, 28, cf. 19. There seems to be no direct confirmation of this in the sources of Seleucid history. But, as stated above, Seleucid control of Armenia must of historical necessity have implied at least claims to a control of Iberia. Possibly, as with the Caliphate, centuries later, both countries were, from the overlord's point of view, regarded as Armenia. At any rate, the project of Seleucus I to dig a canal between the Caspian and the Black Sea (Pliny, *Nat. hist.* 6.31), as well as the Caspian expedition of his and Antiochus I's admiral Patrocles (Strabo 2.1.2-7 etc.; Pliny 2.167-168; 6.58) seem to corroborate the Iberian memory of Seleucid overlordship. As for the Iberian dependence on Tigranes the Great, it is well known from the history of that monarch; cf. e.g., Grousset, *Histoire* 87. Early Iberian history (prior to the fourth century) testifies, as is clear from Leont. Mrov., to the preponderant role of Armenia in Iberian affairs. More than that, there are explicit admissions of the suzerainty of the Armenian kings over the Iberian; Leont. Mrov. 44, 49.

<sup>69</sup> The last King of Iberia of the Third Pharnabazid dynasty, Amazaspes II, was replaced by his sister's son, Rev, son of the King of Armenia; Leont. Mrov. 57-58. This event took place sometime in the eighties of the second century; cf. A. Gugushvili, 'The Chronological-Genealogical Table of the Kings of Georgia,' *Georgica* 1.2-3 (1936) 112. The period was one of great confusion for Armenia, with the throne wrested from one another by several claimants. Thus, in A.D. 140-c.185, that throne was occupied by the Roman candidate, Sohaemus, a

for Colchis — which had become, like Lesser Armenia, a Roman province in the second half of the first century — Caucasia was now, in the spirit of the Peace of Rhandaia, at once under the political aegis of Rome and, by becoming something like an appanage for the cadets of the Imperial Arsacids, under the dynastic aegis of Iran. In the fourth century, the Iberian Crown was to pass through inheritance to a new dynasty, the Iranian Mihranids, known as Chosroïds in Iberia, whose accession coincided with the conversion of the country to the Christian faith.

Culturally speaking, Armenia and Iberia passed through several phases illustrative of their vacillation between their eastern and western neighbors: the Achaemenian and the Hellenistic, coincident with the Orontid and Artaxiad periods in the former and with the Pharnabazid period in the latter; then the Parthian phase of renewed 'Iranianism,' which began with the accession of the Arsacids to the Caucasian thrones and was marked by the dual control of Rome and Iran; and finally, with the Arsacids still on the throne of Armenia, the Christian phase. It was only in these two countries that, during the Parthian phase, the two imperial neighbours reached an equipoise. This equilibrium was fruitful in the sphere of cultural relations; but, for all the occasional destructive outbursts of rival expansionism, it was not altogether unprofitable in the field of political relations as well: it proved to be the guarantee of a perdurable autonomous existence for both Armenia and Iberia, since each rival empire would rather see them free than belonging to the other. In this they differed from the outlying lands of Lesser Armenia, Colchis, and Albania. Though Albania indeed kept its monarchy well into the Christian phase, its fate parallels that of the other two. Exactly as Lesser Armenia and Colchis became too much parts of the Roman Empire, so Albania was to tend to become too much a part of the world of Iran. Moreover, the historical traditions of Albania and West Georgia have kept no memories of the pre-Christian history of these two eccentric regions. To learn their past, one must rely on the sporadic light shed upon them by the historical tradition of their more

---

prince of the House of Emesa, who was, however, related to the Arsacids; this reign was interrupted in A.D. 160-163 by that of the Iranian candidate, the Arsacid Aurelius Pacorus; Asdourian, *Arm. u. Rom* 111-116; Grousset, *Histoire* 111-113; Debevoise, *Parthia* 249, 252-254. The name of Rev's grandson, Bakur (Pacorus) suggests that his connection was with the Arsacids rather than with the Emesan dynasty. — To the Albanian throne, the Arsacids may have come as early as the second half of the first century, i.e., soon after the accession of Tiridates I to the throne of Armenia and possibly owing to the efforts of the Great King Vologaeses I; A. Krymskij, 'Stranicy iz istorii Severnogo ili Kavkazskogo Azerbejdžana (Klassičeskoj Albanii),' *Sergeju Feodoroviču Ol'denburgu* (Akademija Nauk S.S.S.R. Leningrad 1934) 294, interpreting Ps. Moses 2.8 and Moses Kałankatuac'i, *Hist. Alb.* 1.4.15. The Kings of Albania of this dynasty bore the distinctive title of *Aran-* or *Eran-šāh*; Krymskij, *op. cit.*, 294 n. 3; 290 n. 3.



articulate central-Caucasian neighbors and on the *obiter dicta* of foreign sources. In this, Albania stands in the same relation to Armenia (whose cultural, ethnical and political influence rivalled that of Iran) as West Georgia to Iberia, which was the historical nucleus of the Georgian nation preserving its continuity and historical memory.

10. It would seem natural to seek the beginnings of Georgian social history in Colchis, the earliest Georgian political formation. But the dearth of historical material makes it impossible to reconstruct Colchian history with any detail. So far as the early social development of the country is concerned, Strabo († c. A. D. 25) is our only source, though indeed one that has the advantage of first-hand acquaintance with the subject. According to him, after the mythological times, that is, obviously, after the pre-Colchian period, the country was ruled by a line of kings, but it was at the same time divided into *σκηπτουχίαι*,<sup>70</sup> or regions governed by *σκηπτοῦχοι*. In another passage relative to the highland peoples north of Colchis, Strabo explains that personages so designated were dynasts who were subordinate to the higher authority of kings.<sup>71</sup> The annexation of Colchis by Mithridates the Great meant little more than the replacement of the local king by a Pontic representative.<sup>72</sup> Strabo is also our earliest informant about Albania; and his evidence completes what he has to tell about Colchis. Albania appears to have been the youngest Caucasian polity, so that the process of its growth from tribe to nation remained within human memory, and Strabo recorded it. Whereas Albania was previously ruled by an oligarchy of kings — he writes — or, in other words, by the dynasts of its twenty-six tribes, now it is ruled by but one king, supreme over all these tribes.<sup>73</sup> The process so briefly described is analogous to that which produced the empire of Urartu and which must have produced the Colchian system of king and ‘sceptuchs.’ This passage need not be taken, however, to imply the destruction of the Albanian dynastic aristocracy by

<sup>70</sup> 11.2.18 : Τὸ μὲν γὰρ παλαιὸν ὅσῃν ἐπιφάνειαν ἔσχεν ἡ χώρα αὕτη, δηλοῦσιν οἱ μῦθοι, τὴν Ἰάσονος στρατείαν αἰνιττόμενοι προελθόντος μέχρῃ καὶ Μηδίας, ἔτι δὲ πρότερον τὴν Φρίξον. μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα διαδεξάμενοι βασιλεῖς εἰς σκηπτουχίας διηρημένην ἔχοντες τὴν χώραν μέσῳς ἔπραττον.

<sup>71</sup> 11.2.13. δυναστεύονται δὲ καὶ οὗτοι ὑπὸ τῶν καλουμένων σκηπτούχων · καὶ αὐτοὶ δὲ οὗτοι ὑπὸ τυράννοις ἢ βασιλεῦσιν εἰσιν. It is difficult to see why Reinach, *Mithridate* 77, should have thought that there were no kings above the ‘sceptuchs’ in Colchis. For the ‘sceptuchs,’ see *supra* n. 8; *infra* n. 115.

<sup>72</sup> 11.2.18. Αὐξηθέντος δὲ ἐπὶ πολὺ Μιθριδάτου τοῦ Εὐπάτορος, εἰς ἐκεῖνον ἡ χώρα περιέστη · ἐπέμπετο δ’ αἰεὶ τις τῶν φίλων ὑπαρχος καὶ διοικητὴς τῆς χώρας. τούτων δὲ ἦν καὶ Μοαφέρνης, ὁ τῆς μητρὸς ἡμῶν θεῖος πρὸς πατρός.

<sup>73</sup> 11.4.6. Διαφέρουσι δὲ καὶ οἱ βασιλεῖς · νυνὶ μὲν ὅν εἰς ἀπάντων ἄρχει, πρότερον δὲ καὶ καθ’ ἐκάστην γλῶτταν ἰδίᾳ ἐβασίλευοντο ἕκαστοι. γλῶτται δ’ εἰσιν ἕξ καὶ εἴκοσι αὐτοῖς διὰ τὸ μὴ εὐεπίμικτον πρὸς ἀλλήλους.



the super-dynastic Crown, but merely its reduction to a subsidiary position, for this class was to play a great role in subsequent Albanian history.

The Kingdom of Iberia was of a more ancient foundation than that of Albania and it remained an autonomous polity when Colchis had ceased to be one. Therefore, while Strabo does not remember how it has arisen, as he does in the case of Albania, he can give, on the other hand, a detailed picture of the Iberian social and political structure, which he does not give in the case of Colchis and Albania, or, for that matter, of Armenia.<sup>74</sup> And this picture tallies well with the Iberian historical tradition. The historical memory preserved in the Iberian historical writings reaches back to the beginnings of the Iberian polity and enables the historian to trace its evolution from the tribal conditions with a greater precision than is possible in the case of Armenia. The beginnings of the process are, of course, more recent here, and thus closer to the earliest memories of the people, and the process itself is less affected by outside interference than in Armenia. The tradition, to be sure, is enshrined in writings which are posterior in time to the events described, but its basic trustworthiness is borne out by the parallels offered by the social and political development of Armenia, Colchis, and Albania, as well as by the evidence of foreign sources. In collating these several testimonies a clear picture of the genesis of the Iberian polity and society can be obtained.

The time of the evolution from the patriarch to the dynast among the proto-Georgians is difficult to determine. This evolution seems to have taken place among the Mossynoecians, for instance, before Xenophon's day.<sup>75</sup> It must certainly have taken place before their advent to Caucasia among the Colchians, Moschians, and Tibarenians. These are known to have enjoyed fully developed State forms at earlier epochs, though some of them appear to have regressed somewhat thereafter. Forced by outside factors to migrate *en masse*, as people-states already evolved from tribal societies, they may have escaped the revolutionary upheaval of the Heroic Age.<sup>76</sup> On the other hand, the K'art'velians and the Suanians may well have been in a more primitive state when they settled in the Ponto-Caspian Isthmus. As for the Urartians and other Caucasian autochthons whom the proto-Georgians found there, their dynastic social structure must have been similar to, and in sections a part of, the Vannic. Although the coming of the proto-Georgians, no less than that of the Thracio-Phrygians, must have entailed warfare, conquest, and overthrow of old *élites*,<sup>77</sup> it seems quite evident nevertheless that the latter in a measure

<sup>74</sup> 11.14 (on Armenia). For Iberia, see *infra* n. 88.

<sup>75</sup> *Supra* n. 42.

<sup>76</sup> *Supra* n. 7.

<sup>77</sup> Though there are really no indications for supposing the early Iberians to have been, like the proto-Armenians, an army-people superimposed upon the subjugated autochthon

survived in the new circumstances, exactly as, let us say, elements of the Aegean aristocracy survived in the ruling class of Homeric Greece.<sup>78</sup> Arrival of new ethnic groups, moreover, need not always spell domination, as can be seen from the Ḫayasa predominance over the Thraco-Phrygian newcomers to Caucasia. At all events, it is clear from what evidence there is that the evolution in question, the crystallization of a dynastic aristocracy, had taken place among the East Georgians before the Achaemenian empire fell, because that event found them completing the stage, consequent on that evolution, of the formation of a federative system through the subdual of the dynasts by one of them, and then effecting its transformation into the Iberian Monarchy.

The historical tradition of East Georgia, as we now have it, is embodied in two works: the eighth-century *History of the Kings of Iberia* of Leontius, Bishop of Ruisi, and the *Conversion of Iberia*, a compilation of the seventh century.<sup>79</sup> What it has to tell about the beginnings of Iberian social and political history can be reduced to the following seven points. (1) Immigration of the last proto-Georgians to Caucasia.<sup>80</sup> (2) Emergence of the dynastic aristocracy of the K'art'losids claiming common descent from the eponymous deity of the Iberians-K'art'velians, K'art'los, through his sons, each the epo-

---

(cf. *supra* n. 40), as does Manandyan, *O torgovle* 17, the element of conquest must nevertheless have indeed played a certain role in the formation of the Georgian, as in that of any other nation; cf. *infra* n. 97. This element modern Georgian historiography rather tends to understate; cf. Javak'ishvili, *K'art'li. er. ist.*; *K'art'uli samart'lis istoria* I (Tiflis 1928); *Gosudarstvennyj stroj drevnej Gruzii i drevnej Armenii* (St. Petersburg 1905); Allen, *History* 221-227. The following statement of Brosset can not be taken without further qualification: 'En Géorgie, comme dans tous les pays de l'Europe jusqu'au xix<sup>e</sup> siècle, le féodalisme florissait depuis les temps les plus reculés, non, il est vrai, par le droit de la guerre, de la conquête, de la force brutale, mais comme une dérivation de l'état patriarcal, de la construction de la famille naturelle, de l'agrégation sociale, puis de la variété et de l'inégalité des facultés et de l'intelligence' (*Introduction à l'Histoire de la Géorgie* [St. Petersburg 1858] lxxv). J. Karst, *Corpus juris ibero-caucasici* I/2/1 (Strasbourg 1935) 251-254, quite correctly sees the combination of the basic tribal evolution with an element of conquest, but fails to discern by whom that conquest could have been effected and so, according to the familiar *cliché* (*infra*, Note A), suggests 'une ancienne invasion ou immigration ario-mède' (253, but cf. 241).

<sup>78</sup> Cf. Rostovtzeff, *Hist. Anc. World* 184.

<sup>79</sup> In order to avoid confusion between the Georgian Leontius of Ruisi and the Armenian historian Leontius the Priest, the former is herein referred to by the Georgian form of his name 'Leont[i] Mrov[eli]' and the latter by the Armenian form of 'Lewond.' See, for Leont. Mrov. and his dating, M. Tarchnišvili, *Geschichte der kirchlichen georgischen Literatur* (ST 185; Vatican City 1955) 91-94; 'La découverte d'une inscription géorgienne de l'an 1066,' *Bedi Karthlisa* 26-27 (1957) 86-89; and, for the *Conversion of Iberia*, the *Prim. Hist. Iber.*, and the *Royal List I, II, III*, found together with them in the MSS, my 'Caucasia and Byzantine Studies,' *Traditio* 12 (1956) 413-417.

<sup>80</sup> Leont. Mrov. 3-8; *Prim. Hist. Iber.* 49 (for the divergence between the two versions, see *infra* n. 85).

nym of one of the tribal-territorial divisions of Iberia.<sup>81</sup> (3) Rise of the house of the Dynasts of Armazi-Mts'khet'a, deducing themselves from K'art'los' eldest son Mts'khet'os and bearing, as an archaic vestige of the patriarchal past, the title of *mamasaxlisi* ('father of the house'), to a position of primacy among the other dynasts; simultaneous rise of the city of Mts'khet'a to the position of a metropolis among the other Iberian cities.<sup>82</sup> (4) Achaemenid

<sup>81</sup> Leont. Mrov. 8-11. The name 'K'art'losid' (*K'art'los[i]an*) is also found *ibid.* 13, 18, 24, etc. (The Greek endings of the ethnarchal names reflect the Graecism of early Georgian literature; cf. my 'Medieval Georgian Historical Literature,' *Traditio* 1 [1943] 167 n. 14 [= 168]). — Like the Homeric Basileids (cf., e.g., Bury, *Hist. of Greece* 55; Jessen, *Basileus* 56), the Iberian K'art'losids claimed divine descent. In the latter case, this descent was deduced from K'art'los, the divinized eponym of the people. In national literature, however, formed as it was under Christian auspices, the character of gods or demi-gods once attributed to that eponym and his family was changed to that of heroic giants (*gmir*: Leont. Mrov. 3, 4, 6, 7, 8, 9) — possibly under the influence of Gen. 6.4 — and K'art'los himself was attached genealogically to the *tabula populorum* of Genesis by being made a son of Thogarma, who likewise was represented as a giant; Leont. Mrov. 4. Certain revealing details were nevertheless left unaltered. Thus, according to Leont. Mrov. 8-10, 11, K'art'los raised a fortress upon a mountain at the confluence of the Cyrus and the Aragus or Aragvi rivers, and both that fortress and that mountain received thereupon the founder's name, as 'K'art'li' (the same word as that for 'Iberia'; cf. *infra* at n. 113); and it is there that he was buried. His tomb, then, became the centre of an ancestor-cult and was, moreover, connected with an astral cult. The latter cult is believed by specialists to have been peculiar to the proto-Caucasian autochthons; and that of K'art'los, to the proto-Georgian newcomers. The cult of K'art'los may have been connected, as, according to some, is his name, with the chief Urartian god Haldi. The conjunction of an astral religion and ancestor-worship with the eponym of the nation is observable also in Armenia. For all this, see L. Melikset-Bekov, *Armazni (Materialy po Istorii Gruzii i Kavkaza* 1938 2) 19-21; N. Marr, 'Astronomičeskie i etničeskie značeniia dvux plemennyx nazvanij Armjan,' *Zapiski Vostočnogo Otdeleniia Russkogo Arzeologičeskogo Obščestva* 25 (1922); *infra* n. 120. In the Iberian tradition, moreover, K'art'los is represented as a younger brother of Haos, i.e., Hayk, the eponym of the Armenians (*supra* n. 51). And in the Armenian historical tradition, as will be seen (*infra* at n. 120), no less than in the Iberian, traces are found of the divine origin claimed by the Armenian counterparts of the K'art'losids: the Haykids; *ibid.* With the establishment of the Iberian Monarchy, the castle of K'art'li became the centre of the cult of Armaz, chief god of Georgian paganism, as well as of the cults of other deities, and came to be called 'Armaz(n)i'; Leont. Mrov. 25; cf. Tseretheli, *Elements* 41-42, 50; Melikset-Bekov 22-24; *infra* nn. 111, 120. — The assertion of the Iberian tradition that at the beginning the descendants of K'art'los spoke Armenian (Leont. Mrov. 16) may be a memory of the original proto-Caucasian unity, if by Armenian the language of the Hayasa, or of the Urartians, be meant (cf. *supra* n. 30).

<sup>82</sup> Armazi-K'art'li was the original center of the dynasty that was to unify the whole of Iberia; early enough, however, and before the formation of the Iberian Monarchy, it was superseded in that role by the neighboring town of Mc'xet'a — a populous settlement already in the second millennium B.C., as has been revealed by recent archaeological discoveries (Amiranašvili, *Ist. gruz. isk.* 84) — while Armazi remained the holy city of Iberia; cf. Melikset-Bekov, *Armazni* 17-28; cf. Markwart, *Skizzen* 9-23. To the Graeco-Roman world, the first capital was known as Ἀρμωζική (Strabo 11.3.5), Harmastis or Hermastus (Pliny

suzerainty over this dynastic federation.<sup>83</sup> (5) Advent of Alexander the Great and his apocryphal invasion of Iberia.<sup>84</sup> (6) Formation of the Iberian Monarchy, following the liberation of the country from Macedonian rule, by Pharnabazus of the House of Mts'khet'a, who became thereupon, under Seleucid suzerainty, King of All Iberia.<sup>85</sup> (7) Pharnabazid establishment of the system of dukedoms.<sup>86</sup> Before examining the significance of this information, it is necessary to turn to the picture of the Iberian Monarchy as given by Strabo.

Having commented on the great numbers of Iberian cities, some fortified, and on the architectural excellence of their private and public edifices, as well

---

6.11, 12), *Ἀρμακίτικα* or *Ἀρμάστικα* (Ptolemy 5.10; 8.10 tab. 3 Asiae), also simply *Ἀκρόπολις* (Dio Cassius 37.1) — showing by the way that it was also called 'Armaz-c'ixe' ('Armaz-Castle') — and the second capital was known as *Μετλήτα* (Ptolemy 5.10.3), *Μεσχιθά* (Agathias 2.22). — For the rise of the dynasty of Armazi-Mc'xet'a to a position of hegemony, see Leont. Mrov. 10-11. It was no doubt the projection upon the past of the Crown's point of view to assert with our historian that the dissensions among the dynasts (*t'avad* is the term used: having originally the sense of *princeps* and later that of 'prince'; *infra* n. 93) were a corruption of the previous subordination of all to the eldest line of the posterity of K'art'los — a sort of monarchical Golden Age. For *mamasaxlisi* see *infra* n. 89.

<sup>83</sup> Leont. Mrov. 12-16. In accord with the Iranian national epic *Xwāday-Nāmāg* (from which, on his own admission, he borrowed; cf. Toumanoff, *Hist. Lit.* 166-167), Leonti knows of the Achaemenids under the disguise of the mythical Kayanids.

<sup>84</sup> Leont. Mrov. 17-20. The fact of Seleucid overlordship (*supra* n. 68) and of the passing of Iberia, like Armenia (for which, see, e.g., Grousset, *Histoire* 79-80), from Achaemenid to Macedonian control must have implied the presence, or at least the appearance, of Macedonian troops in the country. Strabo, at any rate, preserved the memory of an expedition sent by Alexander, under the command of Menon, to Sper on the confines of Iberia in search for its gold mines; 11.14.9: *Μέταλλα δ' ἐν μὲν τῇ Συσπυρίτιδι ἐστὶ χρυσοῦ κατὰ τὰ Κάβαλλα, ἐφ' ἃ Μένωνα ἐπεμψεν Ἀλέξανδρος μετὰ στρατιωτῶν, ἀνήχθη [ἀνηρέθη, ἀνεδείχθη, ἐδείχθη, ἀπήχθη, ἀνέφχθη, ἀπήγχθη?] δ' ὑπὸ τῶν ἐγχωρίων. Syspiritis κατὰ τὰ Κάβαλλα = Sper; Adontz, *Hist. d'Arm.* 322 n. 2. This and similar other manifestations of Macedonian power must have been represented by the Iberian historical tradition as Alexander's invasion of Iberia itself and his lieutenant Azon's rule in it; for this rule, see Leont. Mrov. 18-23.*

<sup>85</sup> Leont. Mrov. 20-26. According to the *Prim. Hist. Iber.*, 48-49, Azo (= Azon) was not the Macedonian commander, but the first King of Iberia, son of the 'King of Arian-K'art'li,' who was brought, together with followers, to Iberia by Alexander; and Pharnabazus was his successor. 'Arian-K'art'li' of this version refers presumably to the region whence the K'art'vells migrated to Iberia; and this migration is, accordingly, made contemporaneous with Alexander's conquests. The entire story is quite obviously a highly telescoped version of the tradition recorded by Leonti Mroveli. This, however, has not been noticed by modern Georgian historiography, and the information of the *Prim. Hist. Iber.* has been accepted in preference over the less foreshortened version; cf. Berjunišvili, *Ist. Gruzii* 60-61 (where 'Azo[n]' is even equated with Jason); Gugushvili, *Table* 109-110. The fact that the *Prim. Hist. Iber.* may have been compiled at an earlier date than Leonti's History does not, of course, necessarily imply its greater trustworthiness when reporting the memory of such remote events.

<sup>86</sup> *Infra* at n. 104.

as on the similarity between Iberian civilization and those of the Armenians and of the Medes,<sup>87</sup> Strabo proceeds to describe the social structure of Iberia. There are, according to him, four social classes in that country: the first, from which the kings are set up in accordance with genealogical seniority, and to which belongs also 'the second after' the king, who administers justice and commands the army; the second, that of the priests of Georgian paganism; the third, of the warriors and landowners; and the fourth, of the people who are royal servants and who minister to all things pertaining to livelihood. Ownership, he adds, is held in common by every family, but it is the eldest member of it who administers the communal possessions.<sup>88</sup>

Strabo's picture is one of a highly hierarchized polity and it indicates that social crystallization even at the non-dynastic levels must have been achieved in Iberia, no less, it would seem, than in Artaxiad Armenia, and undoubtedly under the influence of the same factors.<sup>89</sup> In the First Class, some historians

<sup>87</sup> 11.3.1, 3.

<sup>88</sup> 11.3.6. *Τέτταρα δὲ καὶ γένη τῶν ἀνθρώπων οἰκεῖ τὴν χώραν · ἓν μὲν καὶ πρῶτον, ἐξ οὗ τοὺς βασιλεῖς καθιστᾷσι, κατ' ἀγχιστεῖαν τε καὶ ἡλικίαν τὸν πρεσβύτατον, ὁ δὲ δεύτερος δικαιοδοτεῖ καὶ στρατηλατεῖ · δεύτερος δὲ τὸ τῶν ἱερέων, οἳ ἐπιμελοῦνται καὶ τῶν πρὸς τοὺς ὁμόρους δικαίων · τρίτον δὲ τὸ τῶν στρατευομένων καὶ γεωργούντων · τέταρτον δὲ τὸ τῶν λαῶν, οἳ βασιλικοὶ δοῦλοι εἰσι καὶ πάντα διακονοῦνται τὰ πρὸς τὸν βίον. κοινὰ δ' εἰσὶν αὐτοῖς αἱ κτήσεις κατὰ συγγένειαν, ἄρχει δὲ καὶ ταμιεύει ἐκάστην ὁ πρεσβύτατος.*

Strabo mentions in the same breath as the Iberians also some highland tribes north of them, undoubtedly vassals of the Iberian Monarchy, who are, according to him, more numerous than the former and, unlike them, similar to the Scythians and the Sarmatians; Strabo 11.3.3. This made Adontz think these tribes to have also been Iberians and equate them with Strabo's Third Class; *Armenija* 407 n. 1. Adontz is also in error when he presumes the Iberians of that time to have been less advanced than the Armenians (*Aspect* 141), because the former had communal ownership; actually, in Armenia, too, property was held communally by a family; *infra* n. 160.

<sup>89</sup> Older historians taught that the class formation in Iberia, and Georgia in general, became crystallized only at the time of Strabo or even later; Javaxišvili, *Gos. stroj* 55; Adontz, *Armenija* 406-409; cf. among modern scholars, Allen, *History* 244-245. Corporate ownership must in part have influenced these opinions (*supra* n. 88), although in actual fact this kind of ownership has no relation whatsoever to the degree of social crystallization, subsisting, as it did, in Georgia well into modern times; Karst, *Corpus juris* I/2/2 (Strasbourg 1937) 147-154, 160-164; cf. D. Lang, *The Last Years of the Georgian Monarchy*, 1658-1832 (New York 1957) 61; *infra* at n. 160. Nor need the prevalence of corporate ownership of gentilitial lands be necessarily taken to imply that private ownership was unknown (cf. Allen, *History* 223-224); for indeed the two systems co-existed in Georgia; D. Gvritišvili, *P'eodaluri Sak'art' velos so'cialuri urt'iert'obis istoriidan* (Tiflis 1955) 271-274; Lang 61-62. In this connexion the term *mamasaxlisi*, which the historical tradition applies to the Dynasts of Armazi-Mc'xet'a (Leont. Mrov. 11, 15, 16, 20, 22), was presumed to have belonged, still in the historical epoch, to every head of family; Javaxišvili, *Gos. stroj* 11-16. However, what sources there are do not help to substantiate this claim; and some medieval and early modern uses of the term (for village chiefs or town mayors; *ibid.* 11-16, 45) appear to have been mere examples



have tended to see solely the royal family.<sup>90</sup> But 'the second [after the King who] administers justice and commands the army' belonged to that class; and he was, as will be seen, none other than the High Constable of Iberia, chief at once of the civil administration of the duchies and of their armed forces, who was not of the royal house, but of the nobiliary body, and in fact — from the Crown's point of view at any rate — its head. Moreover, that a single family should have constituted one of the four divisions of a nation, is not easy to concede. The First Class can only be indeed a class — the dynastic aristocracy of Iberia, including the super-dynastic lineage of the kings.<sup>91</sup> In other words, Strabo here refers to those whom the Iberian historical tradition denominates as the K'art'losids.<sup>92</sup> The Georgian sources of the period subsequent to that of Strabo and to that remembered by the tradition, but antecedent to the *floruit* of Leontius of Ruisi, refer to members of this class, exclusive of the royal family, by the terms *mł'avar* ('prince') and *sep'ecul* ('royal child')<sup>93</sup>

---

of the degeneration of an ancient title. This term is a compound of *mama* ('father'; and of the genitive of *saxl* ('house'), and thus an equivalent of the *paterfamilias* and the Armenian *tanutēr* (*infra* at n. 137). This equivalence, as Javaxišvili (*Gos. stroj* 51, 100-103, 106-107, 121-128, 136-137) himself admitted, was not only etymological, but also functional. As with its Armenian equivalent (and another one: *nahapet*; *infra* at n. 137), the use of the term in historical times was somewhat archaistic and, whatever may have been its pre-historic, tribal uses of which we have no record, decidedly princely. In the same way, the term *saxl* has, in all the instances adduced by Javaxišvili (*Gos. stroj* 31-33), the significance of 'domain' and thus the equivalent of the Armenian *tun* (*infra* at n. 137). See also Karst, *Corpus juris* I/2/1.75 n. 3, 76 n. 2.

<sup>90</sup> Javaxišvili, *Gos. stroj*. 9; Allen, *History* 222.

<sup>91</sup> Karst, *Corpus juris* I/2/1.204, 237-240, 244-249, 251-254.

<sup>92</sup> The eighteenth-century Georgian scholar Prince Vaxušt (natural son of King Vaxtang VI) has preserved much interesting information on the social structure of early Georgia. He asserts that the princes (*mł'avar*) were descended from K'art'los and honored as such; when of the royal family, they enjoyed a still greater consideration; *Geogr. Descr.* (*Ağcera samep'osa Sak'art'velosa*, ed. M. F. Brosset, *Description géographique de la Géorgie par le tsarévitch Wakhoucht* [St. Petersburg 1842]) 12. Vaxušt also mentions the submission of the princes to the Dynast of Mc'xet'a; *ibid.* 6, 8. For the divine descent once claimed by the K'art'losids, see *supra* n. 81. The term K'art'los[i]an, be it noted, had a general and a particular sense: it denoted (a) in an elevated style, the Iberians in general (Leont. *Mrov.* 16; i.e., 'the race of K'art'los,' cf. 'the race of Nemrod' as applied to the Iranians; *supra* n. 68); and (b) the dynasts descended from the Eponym, the K'art'losids *par excellence*.

<sup>93</sup> The earliest instances of the use of *mł'avar* are in: the *Martyrdom of St. Susan* (fifth c.; ed. S. Qubaneišvili in *Jveli k'art'uli ena da literatura* [Tiflis 1947]) 13(41); the *Martyrdom of St. Eustace of Mc'xel'a* (sixth c.; ed. Qubaneišvili, *op. cit.*) 3, 4(47); and various biblical texts, as an equivalent of ἡγεμόν, ἄρχων, πρῶτος; cf. J. Molitor, *Monumenta iberica antiquiora* (CSCO 166: Subsidia 10 [Louvain 1956]) 114. See also Karst, *Corpus juris* I/2/1.204, 237-240, 244-249, 251-254. Like its later equivalent *t'avad*, *mł'avar* is derived from \**t'avel*, *t'av* ('head'); Marr and Brière, *Langue* 636. In compound words, *mł'avar* renders ἀρχι- and -αρχης *ibid.* 636, 629 [*mł'avar-ebiskopos* = 'archbishop'], 648 [*mamał'-mł'avar* = 'patriarch']. — The earliest use of *sep'ecul* is in *Mart. St. Eustace* 3(47); also in Ps. Moses 2.7 (ed. Tiflis 1913;



and show them as ruling, like their Armenian counterparts, over cantons that had undoubtedly been territories of the tribes, from the chiefs of which they were descended.<sup>94</sup> The second term, by the way, is particularly suggestive. However, it is clear that, when these sources were composed, a distinction had come to be made between these reduced dynasts and the super-dynastic holder of the Iberian Crown — the passage, as it were, from the Albanian kings to the Colchian ‘septuchs.’ As for the super-dynasts, Strabo’s assertion that the Kings of Iberia were set up (καθιστᾶσι) may imply some kind of selection, but his statement that the ‘setting up’ concerned κατ’ ἀρχιστεῖαν τε καὶ ἡλικίαν τὸν πρεσβύτατον suggests, on the other hand, a strict genealogical succession. The reference to seniority ‘according to kinship and age’ seems to indicate a fraternal, rather than paternal, succession; but this is contradicted by both the Iberian historical tradition and some contemporary monuments, which all show the Crown to have descended from father to son.<sup>95</sup>

---

p. 105). *Sep’e*, the first part of the compound, is an adjectival formation parallel to the substantive *mep’e* (‘king’); S. Ĵanašia, *K kritike Moiseja Xorenskogo (Materialy po Istorii Gruzii i Kavkaza* 6 [1937]) 477-480. It is, accordingly, a purely Georgian word and one not connected (as affirmed by Marr, Ĵavaxišvili, Adontz, but denied by Hübschmann) with the Armenian *sepuh* (*infra* at n. 138). The second part denotes ‘child.’ Ps. Moses, 2.7 (105), states that the term *sep’cul* designated those who were descended from the first Kings of Iberia; this Ĵanašia takes *au pied de la lettre* and, since he regards the First Class as the royal family only, holds the *sep’eculn* to have been descendants of kings; *op. cit.* 475-503; in *Bull. Inst. Marr* 4/2 (1938) 178; cf. Berjenišvili, *Ist. Gruzii* 108. In the controversy between Ĵanašia and Kakabaje, which went on in the pages of the *Bull. Inst. Marr*, 4/2.163-186. the latter was quite correct in asserting that the First Class was indeed a class and that *sep’ecul* was an equivalent of *mt’avar* (177-178), but he made the mistake of thinking that *aznaur* was another equivalent of the same (cf. *infra* at nn. 97, 98). The text of the *Mart. St. Eustace* has the following: ‘there rose the *mt’avar*ni of Iberia, and Samuel, Katholikos of Iberia, and Gregory, Mamasaxlisi of Iberia, and Aršuša, Vitaxa of Iberia, and the other *sep’eculni*.’ The Katholikos (a prince of the Church), the Mamasaxlisi Gregory, and the Vitaxa Aršuša III were not of the royal house, but members of the princely class, hence at once *mt’avar*ni and *sep’eculni*; for the Mamasaxlisi and the Vitaxa, see Toumanoff, ‘Iberia on the Eve of Bagratid Rule,’ *Le Muséon* 65 (1952) § 15, Excursus A; *Vitaxae* V.

<sup>94</sup> Thus, the *Mart. of the Nine Infants of Kola*, a work of not later than the 6th c. and one reflecting a tradition of still higher antiquity (Tarchnišvili, *Georg. Literatur* 401-403; cf. Karst, *Corpus juris* I/2/1.175-176, 245 n. 4) bears witness to the sovereign rights exercised by the *mt’avar*ni in Iberian cantons; *ibid.* 248. The Princes of Kola are not known to us also from Armenian sources, as are some other Georgian princes of the Georgio-Armenian march-lands; *infra* n. 225.

<sup>95</sup> The historical tradition is conveniently epitomized, in this respect, in Brosset, *Histoire de la Géorgie... traduite du géorgien* II/1 (St. Petersburg 1856) Addition ix: Tables généalogiques 619-622; cf. also Gugushvili, *Table* 112-113; Ingoroqva, *Jv. k’art. matiane*. Of these two, the former cites both the data of Leonti Mrovi and that of the *Roy. List I* and *II*, as well as the results of the researches of S. Gorgaje, *Cerileba Sak’art’velos istoriidan* (Tiflis 1908-1910); the latter, like Gorgaje, seems to regard the *Roy. List*, because attached to the

The Second Class, the pagan priesthood, does not concern us here, for it disappeared with the Christianization of Iberia in the fourth century. The parallelism it presents with other priestly castes of the Eastern Mediterranean is unmistakable, and this, then, must be an additional argument for the definitive crystallization, by Strabo's day, of Iberian society in all its strata, since the other three classes are spoken of by him in the same way as this obviously closed caste.<sup>96</sup>

The Third Class, of free warriors and landowners, seems to have evolved from two groups: the tribal army-people, or its 'Heroic' derivation, the war band, of the proto-Georgians, and, on the other hand, the crystallized lineages of family-heads and lesser clan-chiefs.<sup>97</sup> It is fully revealed in the earliest extant Georgian monuments as the *aznaur* class. It is of course quite possible that in Strabo's time the Third Class, though crystallized as a free stratum distinct from the half-free Fourth Class, had not, nevertheless, as yet acquired a distinctly nobiliary character. But in the Georgian monuments just mentioned it already appears as a nobiliary body: an exact equivalent of the Armenian *azat* class. It is, thus, the class of small landowners and noble warriors, of squires and knights — the lower layer of the nobility that, together with the higher nobility of the dynastic princes, survived in Georgia down to the twentieth century.<sup>98</sup> The Iberian historical tradition traces the beginnings of this class back to the earliest days of the monarchy; and it notes its alliance with the Crown as directed against the K'art'losid dynasts.<sup>99</sup>

---

*Convers. Iber.*, as a better source than Leonti. For the system of succession in Caucasia, see *infra* at n. 159.

<sup>96</sup> Cf. Karst, *Corpus juris* I/2/1.238-239. There is actually no basis for speaking of a 'theocracy' or domination by the slave-owning priestly caste in Hellenistic Iberia, as does Jānašia, in *Bull. Inst. Marr* 4/2.170-173; *Sak'art'velo adrindeli p'eodal. gzaze* (Tiflis 1937) 36-38. The king's theophanic position, which can be inferred from the available data (*supra* n. 81; *infra* at n. 111), does not favor the theory of a priestly domination; and slavery does not appear to have flourished on any extensive scale in Caucasia; *infra* n. 103. — For the Albanian priesthood, see Strabo 11.4.7.

<sup>97</sup> Cf. *supra* at nn. 38-40, 77. It is important to note that the Georgian word *er* means both 'people' and 'army.' In the earliest biblical translations this word corresponds to *λαός, ὄχλος, ὄχλοι, πλῆθος*; whereas its derivative *erisagan* ('one of *er*') is the equivalent of *στρατιώτης*; Molitor, *Monumenta* 105. Jānašia and Kakabaje apply these terms to the Third Class; *Bull. Inst. Marr* 4/2.177-178. Cf. *infra* n. 104.

<sup>98</sup> The earliest sources to mention *aznaur* are the *Mart. St. Susan*, 2 (35), 16 (43), and biblical texts in which it corresponds to *πρωτός* while its derivative has also the significance of 'freedom'; Molitor, *Monumenta* 94. The first part of this compound word is the Armenian *azn*, meaning 'birth,' 'origin,' etc., of which *azat*, the Armenian equivalent of *aznaur*, is a cognate; its second part is the Georgian suffix *-ur*; it is thus, basically, 'one who is born.' Both *aznaur* and *azat* mean at once 'noble' and 'free'; Allen, *History* 224-227; Karst, *Corpus juris* I/2/1.204, 232 and n. 1, 233, 239-241; *infra* n. 167, also n. 228.

<sup>99</sup> Leont. Mrov. 25 paronomastically derives the *aznaur* class from the 1000 'Roman,'

The fourth Class, finally, was the people, urban population no less than rural.<sup>100</sup> The rural peasantry, obviously the largest group in Iberian society, had, exactly as in Armenia, come by this time to depend on great landed proprietors, as tenants or *coloni*, and had started on the way towards serfdom.<sup>101</sup>

i.e., Macedonian warriors of Azon, who passed to the side of King Pharnabazus. Under the latter's successor, Leonti records, 26-27, an insurrection of the high nobility from which the Crown was saved through the loyalty of the *aznaurn*; the King, then, 'humiliated the K'art'losids and honored the *aznaurni*.' This etymology led Javaxišvili, *Gos. stroj* 57, to assume that, in consequence, the K'art'losids in this case were, not dynasts, but all Iberians.

<sup>100</sup> The fact that Strabo says that the people 'provided all things [necessary] for life' (*supra* n. 88) need not perhaps imply that they were exclusively farmers; some may well have been artisans. At any rate, Strabo does mention many urban centres in Iberia (11.3.1), and that must mean that there was an urban *plebs*.

<sup>101</sup> Javaxišvili, *Gos. stroj* 70-71; Allen, *History* 223; Karst, *Corpus juris* 1/2/1.240; Rostovtzeff, *Studien zur Geschichte des römischen Kolonates* (Leipzig 1910) 281; *Soc. Econ. Hist.* 1515 (n. 49); Jānašia, in *Bull. Inst. Marr* 4/2.178; cf. for the Armenian parallel, *infra* n. 174. The adjective βασιλικοί may suggest that the *coloni* were found only on the lands of the First Class, or even, by those who would equate that class with the royal house, only on those of the king's family (so Javaxišvili, Adontz, Allen; cf. Kakabaje, in *Bull. Inst. Marr.* 4/2.178), but this is hardly credible, since the pagan priesthood and temples must surely have had bondsmen, and so also at least some of the Third Class. Now, if certain nobiliary characteristics be conceded to the latter class already at this epoch, or if it be assumed that it represented the conquerors of old as distinct from the conquered (cf. Karst, *op. cit.* 432) and that, consequently, the difference between the Third and the Fourth Class was not only that between the free and the unfree (or half-free), it may be conjectured that the Fourth Class itself consisted both of the free (farmers) and of the unfree (or half-free: *coloni*). This seems indeed to be the situation revealed in the earliest monuments, like the *Mart. St. Susan* 17 (43), where the population of Iberia is spoken of as divided into nobles and non-nobles (*uazno*: since by the fifth century, when this work was composed, the *aznaurn* had indeed become a social class, the latter term must denote non-nobles rather than the unfree; cf. *infra* n. 174). If this was the case in the days of Strabo, βασιλικοὶ δοῦλοι must mean something else. In the first place, δοῦλος need not be taken to mean 'slave'; it can also signify 'subject.' It is important, in this connexion, to exercise a certain caution when dealing with terms applied by Graeco-Roman sources to the social and political phenomena of the Eastern Mediterranean; see on this matter Manandyan, *Probl. ob. stroja* 8, 22; *Zametki o feode* 3-6; Javaxišvili, *Gos. stroj* 71; M. Masson, 'Nekotorye novye dannye po istorii Parfii,' *Vestnik Drevnej Istorii* 1950/ 3 (33) 42 (much of this has to do with the terms δοῦλος and *servitium* as used of what in reality was the Parthian military retainer, one of the *comitatus*; for a compromise: 'personal servant,' see Coulborn, *Comp. Study of Feud.* 337 and n. 1). As Javaxišvili remarks, *loc. cit.*, since the Fourth Class is that τῶν λαῶν, the expression βασιλικοὶ δοῦλοι, predicated of it, cannot mean 'slaves.' As a matter of fact, the juxtaposition of λαῶν and βασιλικοί suggests the λαοὶ βασιλικοί of the Hellenistic Near East: the peasants settled on Crown lands (χωρὰ βασιλική); cf. Rostovtzeff, *Soc. Econ. Hist.* 508f., 562; *Kolonat* 247ff., 258f., 263f., 308f.; Magie, *Roman Rule* II.1028 (n. 72). Accordingly, Strabo's words must simply imply a greater dependence, greater *subjection*, of the Fourth Class, than in the case of the Second and Third, on the holders of sovereign power in the polity, i.e., the entire First Class, since, in addition to being unprivileged subjects, the people were, wholly or in part, also *coloni*.

It is worth noting that there is no mention in Strabo of either merchants or slaves. Undoubtedly the former were then overwhelmingly foreigners; and this was to a great extent the situation in Georgia down to the end of her political institutions.<sup>102</sup> Partly for the same reason, but also because they stood beneath the society he describes, slaves are not mentioned in Strabo's Iberia, although slavery indeed existed in Hellenistic Caucasia.<sup>103</sup>

It is in connexion with a tension between the Crown and the dynasts, and with the endeavor of the former to enhance its ascendancy over the latter that the institution of the dukedoms is to be studied. The office of *erist'av* ('duke') was instituted, according to the Iberian historical tradition, by the first King of Iberia, and patterned upon the Iranian model. That model must have been either the Achaemenian and Seleucid satrap or the Seleucid strategus. There was, accordingly, a duke placed over each of the several provinces or duchies (*saerist'av*) into which Iberia was divided, having under him generals (*spasalar*) and heads of a thousand (*at'asis'av*);<sup>104</sup> all the dukes were,

<sup>102</sup> Karst, *Corpus juris* I/2/1.236; Lang, *Georg. Monarchy* 10, 55; cf., for Armenia, *infra* at n. 174.

<sup>103</sup> Cf. Jānašia, in *Bull. Inst. Marr* 4/2.178. As Manandyan has shown about ancient Armenia — and this must also apply to ancient Iberia — slavery was not found there on any scale of importance or in any way reminiscent of the scale of the Graeco-Roman world; *infra* n. 174; Jānašia, *Sak'art'. p'eodal. gzaze* 37. This, to be sure, clashes with those (e.g., Javaxišvili, *K'art'. samart'l. ist.* 198; Kakabaje and Jānašia, in *Bull. Inst. Marr* 4/2.164-174) who, adverting to Marxian dogma, are fain to discover a 'slave-owning society' preceding a 'feudal' one. — See also Strabo, 11.14.16 and 11.4.7, for the temple slaves in Armenia and Albania. Although slavery may not have played as great a role in Caucasia as it did in the Graeco-Roman world, the former, especially Pontic Georgia, contributed in the course of centuries to its existence in that world and in its Byzantine and Ottoman successors by supplying the material (war prisoners, serfs, etc.) for the East Mediterranean slave trade, from the epoch of the Greek cities on the Pontic coast (Polybius 4.38) to the nineteenth century; Allen, *History* 282-288; Karst, *Corpus juris* I/2/2.76; Lang, *Georg. Monarchy* 22, 69, 201. For the similar situation in Hellenistic Armenia, see Rostovtzeff, *Soc. Econ. Hist.* 782.

<sup>104</sup> Leont. Mrov. 24-25. — *Erist'av* is one of the terms corresponding to *στρατηγός* in early biblical texts (Ezech. 23.12, 23; Luke 22.52; Acts 16.20, 22, 35, 38); other Georgian terms being *spaspet* (*infra* at n. 105), *mt'avar*, *eris-mt'avar*, and various descriptive compounds. In the eighth-century *Mart. St. Abo*, *erist'av* and *eris-mt'avar* are used interchangeably, the latter also translating the biblical *ἄρχων τοῦ λαοῦ* (Acts 23.5). Both terms are derived from the genitive of *er* ('people,' 'army'; cf. *supra* n. 97), the second element being in the one case *t'av* ('head') and in the other *mt'avar* ('prince'); cf. *supra* n. 93. *Erist'av* can be regarded as a functional and semantic equivalent of *Herzog*, i.e., 'duke,' by which title medieval Western documents designate the Georgian *erist'avn* (cf. my 'The Fifteenth-Century Bagratids and the Institution of Collegial Sovereignty in Georgia,' *Traditio* 7 [1949-1951] 186 n. 99; *infra* n. 118), and possibly also of the Urartian *ir-ta*; Marr, *Izbr. raboty* 328, cf. 113. For this office, see Javaxišvili, *Gos. stroj* 62-63, 67-70; *K'art'. samart'l. ist.* 40-63; Karst, *Corpus juris* I/2/1.203, 204, 216-220; Marr and Brière, *Langue* 629. Javaxišvili assumed that *mt'avar* was derived from *eris-mt'avar* (*Gos. stroj* 68; cf. Allen, *History* 239), on the ground that the former was found first: in the Life of St. Serapion of Zarzma. This

in turn, subordinate to the *spaspet* or High Constable of Iberia, who was at the same time *ex officio* Duke of Inner Iberia. He appears to have been, quite unlike his Armenian counterpart, non-hereditary.<sup>105</sup> The institution of the

is inexact: the work in question has reached us in a twelfth-thirteenth-century redaction (P. Peeters, 'Histoires monastiques géorgiennes,' AB 36-37 [1923] 166-167) or in one of the eleventh century (Tarchnišvili, *Georg. Lit.* 103-104, 415); whereas *mt'avar* is found in the two earliest known Georgian hagiographical monuments and in the earliest biblical translations (*supra* n. 93). Moreover, *eris-mt'avar* must of semantic necessity be a derivative of *mt'avar* and not *vice versa*. — According to the treatise on the Georgian institutions with which Vaxušt prefaced his *Geogr. Descr.*, the dukes administered justice, commanded the armed forces, and collected the taxes in their duchies (10-12). The reference to the generals (*spasatar*, from O. Pers. \**spada-sālār*, later *sipāh-sālār*; Hübschmann, *Grammatik* 239) is interesting. The text is vague, but it seems rather clear that it is question of generals, rather than a general, under each duke (Leont. Mrov. 25: სოფლ ამათ ერისთავთა ქუეშე, ადგილთა და ადგილთა, განაჩინნა სპანალარნი და ათახისთავნი = 'and under these dukes, he appointed, here and there, generals and heads of a thousand'). The presence of these under a duke may suggest that, unlike the Armenian princes that were each in command of his own army, the princes of Iberia were deprived of such command in favor of the duke, who then exercised it (in the principalities) through his generals.

<sup>105</sup> Both the Iberian *spaspet* and the Armenian *sparapet* (for which see *infra*, Supplem. Note E) are derived from the Old Pers. *spada-paitiš*, of which the Sassanian (Pehl.) *Ērān-spāh-bād* was likewise derived; Javaxišvili, *Gos. stroj* 68-69; Ehtésham, *Iran Achém.* 63-64; Christensen, *Iran Sass.* 130-132; Adontz, *Armenija* 445. — For the institution of this office in Iberia, see Leont. Mrov. 24-25, who states that, 'prince-like, he administered all the dukes' (*mt'avrobit' gangebdis qovel't'a eris'avt'a zeda*); he is called 'ruler of all the dukes' (*mp'lobeli qovel't'a eris'avt'a*) by Juanšer (786/800), *Hist. Vaxt. Gorg.* (ed. Qauxč'išvili, *K'art'lis C'xovreba* I) 185. Being thus commander-in-chief of the army and at the head of the dukes, who as civil governors administered justice, the High Constable of Iberia was obviously Strabo's 'Second after the King'; and Leontius' text offers further support to this. Immediately before the above statement (24-25), he says: *da ese spaspeti iqo šemdgomadve cinaše mep'isa*. Now, *šemdgomad* is an adverb meaning 'next,' 'thereafter,' and also a preposition (requiring the genitive and the dative-accusative case) meaning 'next to,' 'after,' whereas *-ve* is an enclitic particle used for emphasis and with the sense of 'also,' 'even,' 'still'; Marr and Brière, *Langue* 625, 630. So the meaning of the above phrase can be: 'and this High Constable was also/even/still next (to) before [= in the presence of] the King.' It is difficult to see what the two words, *šemdgomadve* and *cinaše* (a preposition requiring the genitive case) are doing together here, and one is tempted to suspect an omission or error here somewhere. Indeed, the King Vaxtang VI Recension of the Annals has *qovladve* instead of *šemdgomadve*. This word (though ending in *-ve*) simply means 'entirely,' 'in all ways,' 'always' (cf. *qovelive* = *πάντα*, in Mat. 7.12; Molitor, *Monumenta* 106). Possibly both words were in the original phrase, and the similarity of their abbreviated forms in the ecclesiastical minuscules (cf. Leont. Mrov. 25 n. 1) made the copyists omit one or the other. In this case, the original phrase may have been something like this: და ესე სპასპეტი იყო შემდგომადვე, და ყოვლადვე წინაშე მეფისა = 'and this High Constable was also [i.e., in addition to being Duke of Inner Iberia and *spaspet*] next to, and always in the presence of, the King.' At all events, Javaxišvili was perplexed (*Gos. stroj* 68-69), in connection with his belief that the First Class was solely the royal family (*supra* at n. 90), at finding what to him was a contradiction between Strabo's counting the 'Second after the King'



'erist'avate' manifested, like the Achaemenian satrapate, the endeavor of the Crown to supersede its congeners, the dynasts.<sup>106</sup> In Iberia, however, quite otherwise than in Iran, this attempt led not so much to a supersedure of the princes, who proved too powerful for the Crown to destroy, as to their reduction. In this way, some of the sub-kings were, as will be seen, converted into officers of the State, entrusted with the control of others whose allods happened to be included in their duchies. This was, accordingly, largely an attempt to control by sanction what could not be abolished by force. But in this way, the Crown began to claim for itself alone the fulness of sovereignty and gradually to deprive of it, to 'mediatize,' the princes, while sharing it under the guise of delegation with only a few among them.<sup>107</sup> In this endeavor the Crown appears to have received the support of the *aznaur* class, upon which the powers of the 'erist'avate' seem to have reposed.<sup>108</sup>

This delegation of sovereignty claimed by the monarchical theory entailed the development of feudalistic features. It was no longer the question of the upward movement of a dynasticist federation: the subordination of 'polygenetic' dynasts to a super-dynast, but also one of a downward movement:

---

within that class, and that dignitary's unmistakable identity with the High Constable who was not of the royal house; the contradiction, to be sure, does not exist in reality. Some modern authors like to see in the 'Second after the King' a brother or next of kin of the Iberian monarch; Karst, *Corpus juris* I/2,1,238; Allen, *History* 223; Berjanišvili, *Ist. Gruzii* 74; Adontz, *Armenija* 407-408. The reason for this identification, for the support of which there is no direct evidence, seems to be an interpretation of Strabo on the royal succession which I do not believe to be correct; *infra* at nn. 158-161; cf. *supra* at n. 95. Adontz, moreover, seems to have been struck by the fact that the Albanian army that encountered Pompey was commanded by the King's brother (Plutarch, *Pomp.* 35); *Armenija* 409 n. 3. But this is obviously irrelevant. 'Second after the King' was a usual enough way of entitling chief ministers; cf. Esther 13.3, 6. — It is possible that the medieval title *erist'avt'-erist'av* ('duke of dukes,' i.e., 'great duke') originally designated the High Constable (Ĵavaxišvili, *Gos. stroj* 69); in this case, the compound in question must indeed have had at one time a definite administrative significance (like the Armenian *išxanac'-išxan* or the *mep'el'-mep'e* of the late-medieval Georgian constitution; cf. Toumanoff, *Fifteenth-Cent. Bagr.* II), but in the medieval period the distinction between *erist'avt'-erist'av* and *erist'av* was inexistent, the one being a mere *epitheton ornans* of the other. Thus, all attempts to differentiate between the two in that period must fail, since holders of the same dukedoms are indifferently referred to by one or the other of the two terms; cf. Allen, *History* 238-242. — The non-hereditary character of the office of High Constable of Iberia is apparent from Ĵuanšer 145.

<sup>106</sup> Cf. Ehtécam, *Iran Achém.* 110-111, 114, 184; Christensen, *Iran Sass.* 17.

<sup>107</sup> Every Armenian prince, on the other hand, was the duke of his dominions; *infra* at nn. 139-141. This is another indication (cf. *supra* n. 104) that the Iberian Crown was relatively more powerful than the Armenian.

<sup>108</sup> The *erist'av* appears indeed to have been the head of the *er*, i.e., the people-army of his province (for this term, see *supra* n. 97), which is another way of saying that he was at the head of the *aznaurn* of that province; and the Third Class, it will be recalled, makes its



the sharing by the Crown of its 'monogenetic' sovereignty with a social class.<sup>109</sup> As in Artaxiad Armenia, no doubt under the same imperial influences and probably simultaneously with it, Iberia now evolved that symbiosis of the feudalistic and the dynasticist régime which characterizes Caucasian society.<sup>110</sup> The King of Iberia stood at the summit of the two orders, dynasticist and feudal, both as the super-dynast and as the theoretical sole source of sovereignty. He was, moreover, a theophanic monarch, entitled 'Great King' in the monuments of the time.<sup>111</sup> Next to him stood the High Constable-Duke of Inner Iberia, the 'Second after the King,' as head of the feudal order in the realm. But since the holders of the Iberian dukedoms appear to have been, as in Armenia, recruited from the princely class, he must have headed, from the point of view of the Crown at all events, the dynasticist order as well.<sup>112</sup>

11. So much, then, for the origins of the Georgian, more particularly Iberian, social and political structure and for its early development, prior to the Christian phase. The combined evidence of the local historical tradition and of

---

appearance in the Iberian historical tradition as loyal to the Crown and opposed to the dynasts; *supra* at n. 99.

<sup>109</sup> Cf. *supra* at nn. 3-15.

<sup>110</sup> Cf. *supra* at n. 15.

<sup>111</sup> See *infra*, Supplementary Note B.

<sup>112</sup> For Armenia, see *infra* at nn. 139-141. When even in Iran, with its powerful Crown, the satrap was at first the former dynast (*dahyupaiti*) and the nobility monopolized the higher administrative positions (Ehtésham, *Iran Achém.* 114-115, 184, 110-111; Christensen, *Iran Sass.* 19, 20, 25, 258-260), the weakish early Iberian Monarchy can hardly be expected to have dared not to recruit most of its great officers from the dynastic aristocracy. To be sure, the aims of the Crown went counter to the interests of that class, yet by resorting to the principle of *divide et impera*, those aims could be achieved, or at least advanced, without antagonizing that entire class and in fact with the cooperation of some of its members. The Crown, thus, might appoint lesser princes to the position of control over the greater ones, it might give out ducal fiefs to cadets of the princely houses, or it might win over by such grants some of the more important princes. The best indication that the dukes were recruited from among the princes is the fact that Strabo counts the 'Second after the King' with the First Class. The Iberian historical tradition confirms this. Leont. Mrov., 26-27, records the revolt against Pharnabazus' successor that was organized by the dukes of Iberia with the aim of becoming 'independent as we have been at the beginning [= originally]' (დავყვენეთ ჩვენ თავისუფალ, კითარდა ვიყვნით პირველ); the attempt failed thanks to the rallying of the *aznaurn* round the Crown; the King, thereupon, 'seized Iberia and destroyed those who had rebelled against him, sparing some; and he humbled the K'art'losids and honored the *aznaurn*.' The reference to their former independence of the Crown, of which there could have been no question for the dukes *qua* dukes, and the application to them of the term K'art'losid can leave no doubt as to their being of the princely group. Here, at the outset, the Crown's aims can be seen doomed to frustration. The polyhistor Vaxušt states that the dukes were recruited among the princes and the principal personages *Geogr. Descr.* 12. It is evident, of course, that not all of the dukes could be exclusively of the dynastic class, and Leonti, 47, 48, mentions two, for instance (of Ojrxe and of Cholarzene or Klarjet'i) who were of *aznaurn* origin.

Strabo produces a rather complete picture. Quite different is the case of Armenia. The geographer of Amasia left no account of its polity and society, and the Armenian historical tradition, preserved in the *Primary History of Armenia* — dating possibly from the threshold of the fifth century — and in the *History of Armenia* of Pseudo-Moses of Khoren (Khorni or Khoronk') — purporting to have been written c. 480, though its compilation is now generally put at some time between the seventh and the ninth century, and containing invaluable data of much higher antiquity<sup>118</sup> — does not concern itself with the genesis of Artaxiad society, which is, as a consequence, to be elucidated on the basis of various indirect indications of non-Armenian sources. But, if the origins of the social and political system are better remembered in Iberia than in Armenia, the reverse is true when it is the question of describing the workings of that system in the Parthian and Christian phases. On this point the national literary monuments of Armenia shed a far more generous light than those of Iberia.

In the fifth century, terminating the period that had followed the Vannic collapse when foreign languages — Greek, Pehlevi, Aramaic — had to be used by the educated strata of Caucasian society, the Armenians and the Georgians developed their own national literatures. This fact distinguishes the history of the Christian as well as, to a degree, of the preceding Parthian phase from the history of the period that had followed the end of the Vannic empire. Between that event and this, Caucasian history must be based almost wholly on foreign sources and, in a very small measure, on local sources in foreign languages. But now, exactly as in the Urartian days though more richly, the historical development is covered by the evidence of contemporary or near-contemporary national monuments over and above the references coming from the outside. It may be well to note in this connexion that these national literary monuments reveal Armenian and Georgian ethnic and geographical terms that are different from the chiefly Classical ones hitherto used on these pages. A certain amount of internal migrations and readjustments had taken place in Caucasia before its several polities became crystallized, and this resulted in transpositions of geographical and ethnographic names, so that, in the end, local and foreign terms can for the most part be shown to derive from different sets of roots. Thus, the people whom the Iranians and the Greeks designated as Armenians — the origin of this name is still a matter of conjecture — are called by themselves *Hayk'* (singular: *Hay*); and 'Armenia' is *Hayastan*. This ethnicon must have been derived by the Indo-Eu-

<sup>118</sup> For Ps. Moses Xorenac'i, see *infra* n. 123. For the *Prim. Hist. Arm* and its date, see N. Marr, 'O Pervonačal'noj Istorii Armenii Anonima,' *Byzantina Chronica* 1 (1894) 293-299; cf. Adontz, 'Pervonačal'naja Istorija Armenii u Sebeosa,' *ibid.* 8 (1901) and, for an analysis of Markwart's theory of its late origin, Toumanoff, *Orontids* II.

ropean Thracο-Phrygians from the Caucasian Ḫayasa with whom they mingled. In the same way, East Georgia, the Iberia of the Greeks (Hiberia of some Latin authors), is *K'art'li*, and an Iberian *K'art'vel*, in Georgian. This can mean that at a certain epoch the K'art'velians superseded the Tiberians-Iberians in the control of the Cyrus basin. On the other hand, the early-medieval Georgian term for West Georgia, the Colchis of the Greeks, was *Egrisi*, which specialists connect with the ethnicon of the Tibarenians-Iberians; and this, in turn, would indicate an Iberian penetration of the Phasis basin. This division of the Georgian nation into two chief polities, by the way, continued to some extent the duality observable already among the traces of proto-Caucasian Bronze Age civilization and remained a permanent factor of Georgian history. For only three periods have East and West Georgia been united: in the years 1008-1258, 1330-1491, and after the Russian annexation of the nineteenth century. After the first union of East and West Georgia, A.D. 1008, a new Georgian term made its appearance to designate the entirety of the Georgian lands, or 'Georgia': it was *Sak'art'velo*, a derivation of the Ibero-K'art'velian nucleus; and, in this way, *K'art'vel* came to mean both 'Iberian' and 'Georgian.' It is only after that moment that one may speak properly of 'Georgia' as a political and ecclesiastical unit. Now, as for the Albanians, their language having disappeared practically without a trace, it can only be noted here that the Albania of the Classical sources was called *Aluank'* by the Armenians, *Rani* by the Georgians, and (something like) *Arran* by the pre-Islamic Iranians.<sup>114</sup>

<sup>114</sup> Cf. W. E. D. Allen, ' " Ex Ponto " I and II,' *Bedi Karthlisa* (1958) 39-54; Marr, *Izbr. raboty*, esp. 105, 112, 115; Allen, *History* 16-19, 24-29, 54 n. 4, 63 n. 1; Baschmakoff, *Cinqu. siècles* 89-94; Hrozný, *Hist. Asie ant.* 77-83; and bibliogr. *infra* Note A. The name *Κόλχος* may have been preserved in *Kax-et'i* (*-et'* is the Georgian toponymic suffix), the easternmost province of Iberia-K'art'li, which would provide an indication of internal migrations. Moreover, while the south-western province of Iberia, in the Acampsis valley and at the sources of the Cyrus, is called *Mesxet'i* (*Μεσχία* of the Byzantines; cf., e.g., Cedrenus 2.572), the north-westernmost province of Colchis-Egrisi was *Ap'xazet'i* (modern Abkhazia, *'Αβασγία* as the land of the *'Αβασγοί* of the earlier Byzantines; cf., e.g., Procopius, *Bell. pers.* 2.29; *Bell. goth.* 8.3. 4.9. 17; also Toumanoff, 'Chronology of the Kings of Abasgia,' *Le Muséon* 69 [1956] 73 and n. 1; Gugushvili, 'Ethnographical and Historical Division of Georgia,' *Georgica* 1.2-3 [1936] 54-59), both being derived from the root M-S, and its variant B-S. To appreciate the mutations of these Caucasian terms, it is necessary to bear in mind that they often passed through several linguistic strata, each occasionally adding its own determinative suffixes to the original word. There are several Caucasian suffixes indicative of the plural and of origin: *-k/h-i* [= Arm. *-k'*], *-pi/bi* [= Georg. *-eb*], *-n-i* [= Old Georg. *-n*], *-d* [= Georg. *-et'*]. Realizing this helps to detect the persistence of old tribal roots in Caucasian ethnica and toponyms. Thus, e.g., the root K-S: *Kaš-kai*, *Cau-cas-us*, *Κάσ-πι-οι* and (through the mutation *š-l*; cf. *Kašdu-Kaldu*, i.e., *Chaldaea*) *Qul-ḫi* and *Κόλ-χ-οι*, *Κόλ-χ-ις*. Possibly the root X-L is related to it, as in *Hal-ys*, *Χαλ-δ[α]ι-οι*, *Χαλ-ύβ-ες*, *'Αλ-ιζώνοι*, *Alazani*. The root M-S: *Muš-ki*, *Μόσ-χ-οι*, *Mes-x*, and (through the mutation *m-b*) *'Α-βασ-γ-οί* and

Another difference of terminology is in the sociological domain. Prior to the appearance of Armenian and Georgian literatures, the foreign-language sources for Caucasian history applied indiscriminately several equivalents of 'king' and of 'prince' or 'dynast' to representatives of the dynastic aristocracy of Caucasia.<sup>115</sup> On the other hand, these national literatures, when

A-p'xaz. The root B-L: Ta-bal, Ti-bal, and (through the mutation *l-r*) Ti-bar, *Ti-βαρ-εν-οί* [*Ti*]βηρες, 'Ιβηρία, then (through the mutation *b-g*) E-gr-isi, Me-gr-el, Ming-gr-elia. The root K-D (the same as in Կaldi and Kašdu-Kaldu?): *Καρδοῦ-χοι*, K'art'-u/vel, K'art'li. The root Č-N/S-N/H-N: [*Μοσ*]-σύν-οικοι, 'Hvl-o-χοι, \*Han-Hay-asa, Hay. As has been stated earlier, the origin of the ethnicon 'Αρμενίοι-Arminiya is not definitively known. In the maze of scholarly speculation on this subject one can discern three general theories, often overlapping and converging, as to that origin. One, on the basis of some half-legendary data of Greek sources, would connect that ethnicon with the Thraco-Phrygians (Strabo 11.14.12-13 and Trogus in Justin 42.2-3 on the basis of the lost work of Cyrillus of Pharsalus and Medius of Larissa). Another sees in it the same proto-Caucasian-Urartian root as in names like that of Aram, the first Vannic emperor, whom the subsequent Armenian historical tradition incorporated in the theogony of the early kings (Ps. Moses 1.12; *supra* n. 51). Still another would attach it (with Strabo 1.1) to the same root as in 'Aramaean.' The last two theories have occasionally been combined, and the ethnicon in question would appear as *Ar[a]m-en*. In this connexion, numerous geographical and ethnic names, like Thessalian 'Αρμένιον, 'Αρμένη-Ephesus and 'Αρμένη-Sinope, the Cappadocian 'Αριμοι (of the Iliad), the Urartian Armarili, Armiraliu, Armani(?), Armuna, Armiuk, and the proto-Armenian Armawir, have, since the Hellenistic days, offered themselves to the consideration of specialists. For the various discussions of this problem, see Adontz, *Hist. d'Arm.* 311-330; *Armenija* 396-398; Grousset, *Histoire* 74-75; Markwart, 'Le berceau des Arméniens,' *Revue des Études Arméniennes* 8/1 (1928); Lap'anc'yan, *Xajasa* 172-210. The Armenian term for 'Georgian' and the Georgian for 'Armenian' are not devoid of interest in this connexion. The former is *Vra-c'i*, and the land is *Vra-stan* (meaning to-day 'Georgian,' 'Georgia,' but originally 'Iberian,' 'Iberia'), which some derive from *Urarṭu/Urašṭu* (Xudadov *Xaldy*), and which may have been the Thraco-Phrygian term for the proto-Caucasians in general. On the other hand, the Georgian term for 'Armenian' is *Somez*, a contraction of So[n] + Me[s]x i.e., S-N + M-S, the first part representing the Կայasa and the second the Thraco-Phrygians, to whom the pre-Indo-European ethnicon of the Muški came to be applied. The ethnicon of the Albanians, which was something like Aran (= Aram?), had two classical equivalents: 'Αγριοί (*supra* n. 33) and, *via* the Armenian *Aḷuan-k'*, 'Αλβανοί. On the other hand, it is possible that *Vrastan*, *Vrači* are related to 'Ιβηρία; and that 'Αλβανία is a derivation of the root B-L. The kinship of the onomastic data throughout the Mediterranean world — Caucasian and Pyrenean Iberia; Caucasian and Balkan Albania; Abasgi and Basques; Heniochi, Heneti, Veneti, and so many other cases of affinity — is perhaps the most palpable argument in favor of the existence of the 'third' element in that world, for which see *infra*, Supplem. Note A.

<sup>115</sup> In the Hittite, Urartian, and Assyrian monuments, all the Caucasian dynasts are called kings. The Greek sources of the Achaemenian period refer to them as βασιλεῖς and ἄρχοντες; Xenophon, *Anab.* 5.4; *Curop.* 3.1.3, 4. The second term is, of course, ambiguous and, without the juxtaposition of the first, could mean no more than 'commander,' as it does in Herodotus 7.61-82. In the Hellenistic phase terms like βασιλεύς (Plutarch, *Lucullus* 21.5; Strabo 11.2. 13; 11.4.6; Procopius, though belonging to a later period, uses interchangeably βασιλεύς

they appeared, revealed a rich social terminology.<sup>116</sup> These monuments restrict the royal title to the holders of the super-dynastic Crown (both High Kings and Emperors) and designate the subordinate dynasts by various equivalents of 'prince,' 'duke,' or 'lord.' It appears that in earlier times this distinction was not very clear, in Caucasia as elsewhere,<sup>117</sup> and this is the reason why it was not found in the contemporary foreign-language sources. But, after this distinction had become revealed in national documents, foreign sources, too, appeared conscious of it when treating of things Caucasian.<sup>118</sup>

12. The picture of the socio-political structure of Arsacid Armenia, before and after the Christianization, which these national monuments make known is essentially the same as that of the Artaxiad period. Armenia is still a federation of dynastic princes presided over by the — super-dynastic — King of Great Armenia. The number, geography, nomenclature, and juridical position of the Armenian princely States have been well-nigh exhaustively studied by the late Professor Adontz in his first great, and greatest, work on Armenia in the epoch of Justinian. Not the least of the merits of Adontz was that he contributed to the freeing of Armenian historiography from the millennial

---

and ἄρχων for lesser Caucasian dynasts; cf. e.g., *Bell. goth.* 8.3, 9); σκηπτοῦχος (Strabo 11.2.13; cf. 11.2.18; Appian, *Mithr.* 117 — which very appropriately harks back to the Homeric counterparts of the early Caucasian dynasts — the 'sceptre-bearing kings' of Scheria; *Odys.* 8.41; 10.390-391; cf. *supra* n. 8); *proceres* and *megistanes* (also *nobiles*, which is vague; Tacitus, *Ann.* 2.56; 12.44; 15.27; 2.58; 2.2; 6.31, 42) are used of them. Ἡγεμών (Appian, *Mithr.* 117) need not indicate a dynast (any more than *nobilis*).

<sup>116</sup> That of Iberia has already been examined (*supra* at nn. 89-108); that of Armenia will be examined presently (*infra* at nn. 135-173).

<sup>117</sup> The same lack of clear distinction between the βασιλεῖς and the δυνάσται is observable in the late-Seleucid empire; Bengtson, *Strategie* 3 n. 4.

<sup>118</sup> Thereafter, the ordinary dynasts are referred to in foreign sources by a variety of terms, such as σατράπης (*Cod. Theod.* 12.13.6; Justinian I, *Nov.* 31.3; Procopius, *Aed.* 3.1.17-29; — for the six Roman Satraps, see *infra* at nn. 182, 201-203), ἄρχων (Procopius, cf. *supra* n. 115; Constantine Porphy., *De caerim.* 2.48), κύριος (Theophanes, *Chron.* [PG 108] 792, 793; also the vague πρῶτος; *ibid.* 796, 797), princeps (Anastasius Apocrisiarius [PG 90] 174-176), dux (Aeneas Sylvius [Pius II], *Epistolarum lib.* I [Basel 1571] 849-850; L. Wadding, *Annales Minorum* XIII [Rome 1735] 153, 160); but the super-dynastic kings are invariably βασιλεῖς and reges. It was only after the Greek term for 'king' had become, in the seventh century, the official Byzantine translation of *imperator* that the Byzantines began avoiding its use for foreign kings; cf. e.g., G. Ostrogorsky, *History of the Byzantine State* (Oxford 1956) 95 n. 2 (95-96). As a result, foreign loan words like ρήξ and various circumlocutions were used of them, in Caucasia as elsewhere. Thus, the Kings of Armenia were styled ἄρχων τῶν ἀρχόντων μεγάλης Ἀρμενίας, those of Iberia, κονροπαλάτης Ἰβηρίας and those of Abasgia (former Colchis) ἐξουσιαστής Ἀβασγίας; Constantine Porphy., *De caerim.* 2.48. It is not correct, therefore, to argue, as does Javakishvili, *K'artl. er. ist.* II (Tiflis 1914) 391, a diminution of the international position of the Caucasian States from the fact that, by the tenth century, their rulers had no longer been called βασιλεῖς by the Byzantines.



influence of the writer who is known as Pseudo-Moses of Khoren. This somewhat mysterious and deliberately mystifying author, a poetic antiquarian and a too ingenious erudite who pretended to be writing at an epoch far anterior to his own, not only preserved ancient historical traditions, but also forged a tradition, a school, of his own, which completely disfigured the past and so molded the historical perspective of generations to follow. On one point, however, Pseudo-Moses was right, exactly as Adontz was right: and that was in adverting to the paramount importance of the dynastic aristocracy of Armenia. His work, really, is largely a treatise on the Armenian princes.<sup>119</sup>

The opening part of the *History of Armenia* of Pseudo-Moses and the *Primary History of Armenia* present two different versions of the genealogy of the early, mostly mythical, Kings of Armenia. This genealogy represents a blend of theogonies of the pagan past — divinities became heroes in the Christian monuments — with a pell-mell of reminiscences about the Vannic, proto-Armenian, and early Armenian rulers. Both versions trace this heroic stemma back to the eponym of the Armenians, Hayk, through another eponym Arama-neak or Armenak, and derive from this mythical, once divine, royal race many of the princely houses of Armenia, as collateral branches.<sup>120</sup> This is an indirect

<sup>119</sup> Adontz, *Armenija* 237-238, 489-490 (on Ps. Moses); 211-213, 28-45, 236-493 (on the princes). See also Manandyan, *P'eodal. Hay.* 32-124.

<sup>120</sup> *Prim. Hist. Arm.* 2-10; Ps. Moses 1.5-31 (this occupies practically the entire Book One; history begins in Book Two). Like K'art'los of the Iberians (*supra* at n. 81), Hayk is made in Christian Armenian historiography a son of Thogarma, and so connected with Genesis, and his pagan deification is watered down to his being one of the giants (Ps. Moses 1.10: 'i mej skayic'n). Nevertheless, traces of his cult, part ancestor worship and part astral religion, survived, as also in the case of K'art'los. His name designated Orion; Marr, *Astronom. značeniya*. More than that, Ps. Moses (3.65[364]) felt obliged to deny that 'the princes, as the poets say, be of the kin and race and seed of the gods' (և ոչ, որպէս քերթողքն ասեն, մերձազաւակք և մօտասերք զոյ և նոյնասերմանք աստուածոց իշխանք). Finally, several deities of the pantheon of the pagan Armenians were incorporated in the genealogy — the theogony — of Hayk's descendants, such as Tork'-Angl, who was, according to the *Prim. Hist. Arm.* 9, worshipped as a god in pagan times (cf. also Ps. Moses 2.8); King Ara the Fair, the object of Semiramis' love, whose story is found both in the *Prim. Hist. Arm.*, 7-8, and in Ps. Moses, 1.15; and King Vahagn, also said to have been worshipped by pagan Armenians and Iberians; Ps. Moses 1.31. Tork'-Angl represents a syncretistic figure, at once Tarku/Tarḥu, the Asianic divinity of fertility and vegetation, and the Ḫayasa-Armenian god of the netherworld, an equivalent of the Sumero-Akkadian Nergal, the solar deity of war and the dead (in the Armenian Bible, 'Angl' translates 'Nergel'; 4 Kings 17.30). Ara was the Armenian version of the Asianic Araš/Attys (and Semiramis a memory of Cybele), who as 'Er the Armenian' appears in Plato's *Rep.* 10. Vahagn was the Armenian equivalent of the Indo-Iranian *Vr̥trahan-Vēr̥θrağna* (= Hephaestus). For all this, see my *Orontids* I.14-15, II; Marr, *Astron. značeniya*; Adontz, *Vestiges*; 'Tarku chez les anciens Arméniens,' *Revue des Études Arméniennes* 7 (1927); Lap'ančyan, *Bogi Armjan* 273-276, 318-323; *Xajasa* 84-98. — Besides these mythological figures, the genealogies of the early kings contain some Vannic, Orontid, and Artaxiad monarchs and the eponyms of va-



but obvious proof of these houses' immemorial tribal-dynastic origin<sup>121</sup> and an exact parallel of the Iberian social ethos: the Haykids of Armenia are the counterparts of the K'art'losids of Iberia.<sup>122</sup> But the work of Pseudo-Moses was compiled at a time when the ethos of the Armenian princely group had begun to wane under the double pressure, as it appears, of the Abbasid Caliphate, which had succeeded in the mid-eighth century to the suzerain rights over the country, obtained a century earlier by the Umayyads, and of the rising Bagratid Monarchy — soon to evolve into the Fourth Armenian Kingdom — in the eighth-ninth centuries. A society as marked by vigor and vitality as was that of Armenia prior to the Abbasid-Bagratid epoch could hardly have evoked the antiquarian interest that inspires and pervades his History.<sup>123</sup> The new spirit

---

rious tribes; cf. Piotrovskij, *Urartu* 283-284, 334-335, 338; Manandyan, *O nck. sporn. probl.* 145-155. — The fact that these theogonies contain certain historical kings alongside pagan deities, and at the same time represent some of the latter as Kings of Armenia or members of their family, suggests the existence among the pre-Christian Armenians not only of the claims of the dynasts to be descended from gods, but also of the cult of the kings; cf. also Ps. Moses 2.66, and Lap'anc'yan, *Xajasa* 86; *Bogi Armjan* 284-285. This 'pattern of divine kingship,' the Hellenism of the Orontids and the Artaxiads must have enhanced. The Orontid necropolis at Angl appears to have been associated with the cult of a solar deity of the nether-world and a vegetation cult; *Orontids* I.14-15. The Commagenian Orontids associated in the *tumulus* of Nimrud-dağ ancestor worship with the cult of Zeus-Oromasdes (the sky), Apollo-Mithras-Helios-Hermes (the solar psychopomp), and (the astral) Artagnes (*Vëřëθ-rağna*)-Heracles-Ares; L. Jalabert and R. Mousterde, *Inscriptions grecques et latines de la Syrie I: Commagène et Cyrrhestique* (Paris 1929) 15-16. The Armenian Arsacids had their necropolis at Ani (now Kamax), in Upper Armenia, and their ancestor worship was associated with the cult of the Asianic sky- and fertility-god Mazan (Masanes), Iranianized as Aramazd and syncretized with Zeus; Arm. Agath. 109/785, 12/125; Gk. Agath. 132, 56; Gk. Life of St. Gregory 110; Arab. Life 98; Faustus 4.24; cf. Lap'anc'yan, *Xajasa* 86. Cf. *supra* n. 111 for the association of the Kings of Iberia with the holy city-necropolis of K'art'li-Armazi, which was a center of ancestor worship, an astral cult, and the cults of the sky-god Tešub, Iranianized as Armaz, and the vegetation-god Zaden.

<sup>121</sup> Adontz, *Armenija* 491.

<sup>122</sup> *Supra* n. 81 and at nn. 90-94.

<sup>123</sup> This is Adontz's chief argument for so dating Moses Xorenac'i; *Armenija* 237-238, 489. Most modern investigators — Xalat'eanc', Akinean, Manandyan, Lewy, to name but a few besides Adontz — assign the work in question to one or another date between the seventh and the ninth century; yet the traditional dating as of the fifth, suggested by a few broad hints in the work itself (3.61, 62, 68), is still defended by the nationalist Armenian scholar M. Abelyan, *Istorija drevnearmjanskoj literatury* I (Erivan 1948) 203-209. Passing over the much disputed problem of the correlation of the text of Ps. Moses and those of the *Eccl. Hist.* of Socrates and of the Life of St. Silvester, as well as over Fr. Akinean's conjecture that Ps. Moses was none other than Leontius the Priest, the following facts, because facts and not conjectures, cannot be overlooked. (1) Ps. Moses projects (1.14) into a remote past the division of western Armenia and of some neighbouring lands into I, II, III, and IV Armenia which was instituted by Justinian I in 536; Adontz 203. — (2) He uses the term 'Sisakan' to designate Siunia, which term makes its earliest appearance in the Syriac chron-

manifests itself also in the fact that Pseudo-Moses denies the dynastic origin of a number of the princely families, and attributes, instead, their position to a creation by the Crown in recompense for services to the State. This watering down of dynasticism and this emphasis on *étatisme* would have been utterly anachronistic before the Abbasid-Bagratid period.<sup>124</sup> It so happens, moreover, that whenever the origins of the houses placed by him in this category can be ascertained, their descent from the dynasts of old appears beyond all doubt.<sup>125</sup> No less than Caucasian historiography ancient and modern, Pseudo-Moses fails

---

icle of Zacharias Rhaetor (554) and is unknown to the early Armenian historians like Faustus, Lazarus, Eliseus; *ibid.* 421 n. 3. — (3) He uses the term 'Vaspurakan' (2.62) to designate the province east of Turuberan, which came to be so called after the partition of Armenia in 591; *ibid.* 232 and n. 1. — (4) In 3.18, he speaks of the Iranians penetrating Bithynia in a war on the Empire, which they for the first time effected in the war of 604-629. — (5) In 3.46, he mentions the institution of a presiding prince, besides the Roman *comes Armeniae*, in the provinces belonging to the Empire, which is a reminiscence of the situation first taking place after Heraclius' victory over Iran in 629. — (6) For him, his hatred of the Mamikonids is a corollary of his devotion to the Bagratids, which can only be the outcome of the dynastic policies of the two houses as they were shaped after the mid-eighth century; cf. Akinian, 'Moses Chorenaci,' RE Suppl. 6.536. It is not devoid of significance perhaps that in defending the 'traditional' date of Ps. Moses (A.D. 480), Abelyan relies extensively on the earlier works of F. C. Conybeare and seems to be unaware of the latter's subsequent opinion, in the *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, 11th ed., s.v. 'Moses of Chorene' (jointly with A. v. Gutschmid), as to Ps. Moses's writing sometime between 634 and 642. Cf. *Orontids* II.

<sup>124</sup> Cf. Adontz, *Armenija* 263-271, 489-491. — The Caliph's suzerainty implied a forceful intrusion of the *étatiste* principle in Caucasia; simultaneously, the terrible warfare — revolts and repressions — that accompanied it resulted in the reduction, and destruction, of numerous princely houses and in the rise of a few great — super-dynastic — princely States, superseding or controlling the lesser ones, which also conduced to a strengthening of the Crown. For all this, see Grousset, *Histoire* 320-322, 329-334; J. Laurent, *L'Arménie entre Byzance et l'Islam* (Paris 1919) 61-62, 71-82.

<sup>125</sup> Ps. Moses mentions 38 houses as 'raised' to the princely status by the kings; of these, 13 are, on his own admission, Haykids (Apahuni, Arawenean, Ašoc', Bznuni, Manawazean, Mardpet, Orduni, Sisakan-Siunia, Slkuni or Slkuni, Xorxořuni, Vah[n]uni, Varažnuni, Zarehawanean [1.12; 2.7. 8]) and 17 more are, as we know irrespective of what he has to tell about it, also of unquestionable dynastic origin (Amatuni [2.57]; *Arsacids*: Kamsarakan, Abelean, Gabelean, Hawenuni, Spanduni, Jiwnakan, Rop'sean [2.7, 42, 44, 73, 90]); Mami-konean [2.81]; Mandakuni [2.8]; *Orontids*: Arcruni, Arzanene, Bagratuni, Gnni, Ingilene, Sophene [also Arawenean, Colthene, Zarehawanean] [1.22, 23; 2.3, 7, 8, 9, 33, 63]; Aruelean or Arawelean, descended from the Kings of Albania [2.58]). The origin of the remaining 8 (Akē, Anjewac'i [2.8], Corduene [*ibid.*], Dimak'sean [2.47], Gnt'uni [2.7: Canaanites], Gogarene [2.8: Iranians], Moxoene [*ibid.*], and Truni or Trpatuni [2.47]) is not ascertainable, but there seems to be no question as to their dynastic origin. Ps. Moses, 2.8, mentions 5 more Haykids (Colthene, Gardman, Otene, Tašir, Zabdicene) and one house descended from Astyages of Media (Murac'an; also 2.44) without insisting on their ever having been 'created' princes. Ps. Moses comes nearest to truth in 2.3, where he states that 'naxararates' (see at n. 140) were given to various dynasts. For the houses here mentioned, see *infra* at nn. 181-203 and my *Lists*.

to distinguish between the two modes of nobiliary existence: feudalism and dynasticism. But when he depicts the Armenian monarchs as effecting a reorganization of the realm, tightening governmental controls, distributing offices of the State among the princes, and even 'creating' new princely houses, he confirms what has already been noted about the introduction in Caucasia, under the influence of the great centralized empires of the Achaemenids and the Macedonians, of certain feudalistic features by the Artaxiads of Armenia and by the Pharnabazids, or also Artaxiads, of Iberia.

Now, one of the errors that both Pseudo-Moses and the *Primary History* must have derived from an older tradition was the idea that the Artaxiads had been a branch of the Iranian Arsacids, the rise of the latter in Parthia being contemporaneous with the rise of the former in Armenia; and that the Armenian Arsacids had, consequently, been a direct continuation of the Artaxiads, as one continuous Arsacid dynasty of Armenia, from the second century B.C. to the respective moments when the two historical works terminated their narratives. Since, as a result, Pseudo-Moses speaks of the Artaxiads as Arsacids, Adontz thought that the innovations ascribed by him to them had indeed been carried out under the real Arsacids of Armenia, that is, beginning in A.D. 63.<sup>126</sup> Modern historiography has corrected this misapprehension.<sup>127</sup> It could nevertheless be assumed that the process begun under the Artaxiads indeed received a fresh impetus under the Arsacids through their imitation of the service mechanism of their cousins' Parthian empire.<sup>128</sup>

<sup>126</sup> Cf. Adontz, *Armenija* 211-212, 236, 433, 453-454, 489-491; cf. *supra* n. 52. — It was the legendary first 'Arsacid' Vałaršak who was supposed to have achieved the new organization of Armenia; Ps. Moses 1.8-9; 2.1-8.

<sup>127</sup> Manandyan, *P'eodal. Hay.* 247-251; *O torgovle* 67-69; *Probl. ob. stroja* 27; *Tigran* 57-58.

<sup>128</sup> Adontz's argument in favor of putting the beginnings of Armenian feudalism in the Arsacid period is grounded in a number of misconceptions. He begins by equating — and he is not alone in this — the princely class with feudalism; he thus fails to discern the dynastic-allodial order as distinct from, and parallel to, the feudal-administrative one; for him (as indeed for Manandyan; *P'eodal. Hay.* 241-242; *O torgovle* 46-48) the Armenian social process consisted in passing from the primitive tribal to the more advanced feudal phase: this feudalization was the origin of the princes; *Armenija* 436, 444, 491. He would thus derive the Armenian principedoms from the 'comarchies' of the Achaemenian period (*supra* at n. 38) through the intermediary, *étatiste* phase of the *strategiae*, mentioned by Pliny (*supra* at n. 65); the latter, he consequently regards as *inchoate* principedoms; *Armenija* 391-392, 433-436. Now, this derivation is only in part correct. Many of the 'comarchies' must have failed to become principedoms — exactly as their Iranian counterparts must, obviously, have failed, since there were ultimately only a few princely houses that derived from the *viθapaitiš* group (cf. Ehtéčam, *Iran Achém.* 21 and n. 4) — and so went to form the lesser noblesse; and, on the other hand, most of the princes owed their origin to the dynasts-*βασιλεῖς* who were contemporaneous with and superior to the 'comarchs,' but whom the Ten Thousand on their brief journey through (proto-)Armenia simply had no occasion of meeting (*supra* n. 43). Adontz, next, betrays the influence of ancient Armenian historiography with its confusion be-

13. And so the monuments of Arsacid Armenia reveal a society that, to a greater degree even than in Iberia, was marked by a symbiosis of full dynasticism and full feudalism. The Armenian nobility, higher and lower, participated, accordingly, in these two régimes. The higher nobility was composed of the princely dynasties in control of the several princely States into which the Kingdom of Great Armenia was divided.

En théorie [writes Adontz] on peut dire que les terres des vassaux, comme elles sont soumises à l'autorité de la couronne, appartenaient à celle-ci et, dans un sens, les domaines des princes arméniens pouvaient être regardés comme des fiefs-seigneuries. En réalité, les terres des princes arméniens n'étaient pas des fiefs proprement dits, s'il faut comprendre par fief une possession conditionnelle. Le service militaire que leurs bénéficiaires rendaient au roi était considéré, peut-on dire, moins comme un devoir que comme un privilège. Les domaines princiers formaient des principautés autonomes, leurs immunités fiscale, administrative et judiciaire n'étaient pas acquises, mais inhérentes à leur nature, à leurs origines.<sup>129</sup>

To avoid the confusion between the dynasticist and the feudal aspect of the Armenian princes — *réalité* and *théorie* — which marks this passage, and which is due precisely to the symbiosis of the two modes of nobiliary existence, it may be well to examine each aspect separately.

The dynasticist aspect of the princely group is manifested first of all in the fact that the principalities of Armenia were fully sovereign States, in the sense in which the principalities of the Holy Roman Empire after the Peace of Westphalia are said to have been sovereign States. But the Germanic princes, hardly

---

tween the Artaxiads and the Arsacids (*supra* at n. 126); and he, moreover, argues that since Strabo does not mention any *strategiae* in Armenia, whereas Pliny does, the rise of these administrative units must be placed between the epochs of the two writers, i.e., in the Arsacid period; *Armenija* 391-392, 433; *Aspect* 141. But Strabo says absolutely nothing about any aspect of Armenia's social structure, so that his silence cannot be used as the basis of any argument. Actually, Adontz himself is forced by the facts at his disposal to admit elsewhere that princedoms existed in Armenia before the Arsacid period, under Tigranes the Great or even earlier; *Armenija* 212, 236, 410-415, 444-445, 461, 491. The institution of the princedoms was — it has been seen throughout this study — quite independent of any feudal-administrative institutions, such as the *strategiae*, that the Crown might attempt to impose upon it (cf. *infra* at nn. 207-208). This said, it must nevertheless be stressed that the Parthian phase, ushered in by the establishment of Arsacid rule in Armenia, implied an enhancement of Iranian social and political influence; cf. Manandyan, *P'eadal. Hay.* 241-242, 248-251. It is to this epoch, therefore, rather than to the Achaemenian or, *a fortiori*, the Hellenistic, that the great mass of Armenian social and political terms of unquestionably Iranian origin must be due, as well as the introduction of various patently Iranian offices, such as the Coronant, the Seneschal, the Grand Chamberlain, and possibly also the High Constable; cf. *Armenija* 444-450. It is difficult not to see, however, that these patterns of the more bureaucratized Parthian empire were introduced in Armenia precisely with a view to curbing the 'polygenetic' sovereign rights of the already existent princedoms.

<sup>129</sup> *Aspect* 143.

any of them of dynastic origin, indeed owed their rights to a concession of the Crown, whereas the rights of the Armenian, and Georgian, dynastic princes were anterior to those of the Crown itself, and any concession on its part was a legal fiction. These immemorial rights included an executive, judiciary, legislative, and fiscal independence; control of the armed forces of the principalities; and, from the princes' point of view at least, the right to negotiate with foreign powers.<sup>130</sup> On the international scale, these princes received the treatment of minor kings.<sup>131</sup> Yet, immemorially also, the princes were bound by ties of political subordination to a super-dynastic Crown, Armenian or other, which happened to be mightier than they. However, what is very important, these princely States, because territorialized tribes or clans, constituted not only autonomous, but also perfectly self-determined political units which, no matter what the degree of their outward dependence on other and greater States, could and did exchange one suzerain for another without in the least affecting thereby their own integrity and identity.<sup>132</sup> Juridically, all the principalities appear to have been coequal, although in actual fact they differed widely in importance and size and, moreover, obeyed a fixed and elaborate system of precedence which obtained alongside the theoretical coequality.<sup>133</sup> From the point of view of government, each princely State was a microcosm of the Armenian kingdom; whereas the Arsacid King of Great

---

<sup>130</sup> Adontz, *Armenija* 104-110, 179, 453, 467; *Aspect* 134; Manandyan, *P'eodal. Hay.* chap. 10. For the military aspect of the princely States, see *infra* at nn. 146, 164, 188, 204-207. In Georgia, a very similar situation continued for many centuries to come, until the *étatisme* of the *grands-monarques* of the Golden Age (eleventh-thirteenth centuries), expressed in the predominance of feudal-administrative over the dynasticist forms, and the partition of princely domains after the fifteenth century (Karst, *Corpus juris* I/2/2.161) largely 'mediatized' the Georgian princes. In the last centuries of Georgian independence, however, the princes regained a large measure of their former independence; cf. Gvritšivili, *P'eodal. Sak'art'*. 310-461, also 253-259; Lang, *Georg. Monarchy* 60-62.

<sup>131</sup> *Infra* at nn. 202-203.

<sup>132</sup> Thus, the northern princes vacillated between Armenian and Iberian allegiance; the western between Armenian and Roman; the eastern between Armenian and Iranian or Albanian. In 428 most of the Armenian princes transferred their allegiance from the King of Armenia to the Great King of Iran.

<sup>133</sup> Adontz, *Armenija* 453, 461. Ancient Armenian historians even speak of 'senior' and 'junior' (*awag*, *krtser*) princes, but this must have been a matter of common parlance rather than of legal terminology. In the same, descriptive, way they refer to the high nobility by the terms *awag* and *mecamec*, used either as adjectives ('senior,' 'great') or as substantives ('seignior,' 'grandee'); cf., e.g., Faustus 3.8 (31); 3.12 (42); 3.21 (64); 4.2. (76); (the late-fifth-century) Lazarus of P'arbi, *Hist. Arm.* 13 (ed. Tiflis 1907; 46, 47); 16 (55); 25 (96); 26 (98). For the precedence among the princes, see Toumanoff, *Lists* III. Needless to add, the existence of such a precedence did not impair the essential parity of the princes, any more than it can impair the essential coequality of any body of peers.



Armenia was, besides being the lord paramount of the princes of his macrocosm, also a prince himself in his royal domain of Ayrarat in central Armenia.<sup>134</sup>

The Armenian literary monuments usually attribute to the King of Great Armenia, as also to the Emperor and the Great King, simply the title of king (*ark'ay* or *t'agawor*).<sup>135</sup> The generic term for 'prince,' as revealed in these sources, is *išxan*, equivalent to the Georgian *mt'avar*, but, unlike it, applicable to High Kings, their cadets, and sub-kings alike.<sup>136</sup> This may be an indication

<sup>134</sup> Adontz, *Armenija* 462-463, 468.

<sup>135</sup> Cf. Kherumian, (note 167) 8. — The Roman Emperor was occasionally called 'Great King' (*mec t'agawor*) or 'Caesar' (*kaysr*); cf., e.g., Eliseus, *History of the Followers of Vardan* 3 (ed. Tiflis 1913; 92, 93). Conversely, prior to the seventh century, both the Emperor and foreign kings were called by Greek writers βασιλείς; however, the official translation of *imperator* was then αὐτοκράτωρ; cf. Ostrogorsky, *History* 95 n.2; *supra* at nn. 115-118. — Regarding the date of Eliseus the Vardapet there have been almost as many divergent views as in connexion with that of Ps. Moses (*supra* n. 123). Those who, with Fr. Akinian (*Elīšē Vardapet* I [Vienna 1932]) would see in him an author, not of the fifth century, as has been his traditional dating and his own claim, but of the seventh, must face the difficulty of explaining how, in view of the religious development of Armenia of the time, he could refer to the 'holy clergy' of Constantinople (3[103-104]: *ի մեծ քաղաքն առ սուրբ ուխտ հկեղեցւոյն*) after A.D. 555 and, after A.D. 505/506, to the 'holy Bishop of Rome' thanks to whom the first Christian King Tiridates had received the Faith (3[92]: *սոյնպէս և զհաւառսն որ ի Քրիստոս ընկալեալ ի սուրբ եպիսկոպոսէն Հռովմայ...*). For that religious situation, to be treated later on, see my 'Christian Caucasia between Byzantium and Iran: New Light from Old Sources,' *Traditio* 10 (1945) esp. 137-145. At the same time, Eliseus' almost deliberate avoidance of all Hellenisms of style does not invite the suggestion that he belonged to the Unionist trend which, in cooperation with the Byzantine government, brought about five religious reunions between (parts of) Armenia and Byzantium within the century following the year 555. For this, see *ibid.* 148-162.

<sup>136</sup> The Iranoid root of the words *išxan*, *išxanul'iwn*, *išxem* ('I command,' 'I rule') is *išx/ašx*, which is related to the Sogdian *axšavan/xšēvan* ('king') and the Old Pers. *xšayāθiya* ('king') and which is also found in the Armenian and Georgian equivalents of *vitaxa*, as well as in the Arsacid royal name of Axedares (King of Armenia c. A.D. 110; Asdourian, *Arm. u. Rom* 103); the basic meaning of *išxan* in the biblical texts is 'ruler,' 'prince,' *ἄρχων*, *ἡγεμὼν*; cf. Meillet, *Altarmenisches Elementarbuch* (*Indo-germanische Bibliothek* 1/1/10 [Heidelberg 1913]) 185; E. Benveniste, 'Titres iraniens en arménien: Nakharar,' *Revue des Études Arméniennes* 9/1 (1929) 7-10; Markwart, *Eranšahr* 178-179; Toumanoff, *Vitaxae* I (see there also Łapa'anc'yan's dissenting opinion on the root of the term). In the Arsacid period, *išxan* provided a curiously exact equivalent of 'prince' in its several senses: (a) a monarch; *Prim. Hist. Arm.* 14 [*išxank' Par'ec'*]; Lazarus 14 (48); — (b) a royal prince (= one meaning of the German *Prinz*); Lazarus 14 (51); — and (c) a non-royal prince or sub-king (= *Fürst*); Lazarus 14 (52) [*išxanac'n hayoc'*]: the most widespread use. Later in the medieval period this title came to designate the greater princes controlling lesser ones (called then *naxarark'*; *infra* at nn. 140-142); cf. Laurent, *Arménie* 71-75; *supra* n. 124. — It is important to bear in mind that the prevalence in Armenian society of Iranian or Iranoid terms, like *išxan*, need not necessarily signify that the institutions designated by them were themselves borrowed from Iranian society or even akin to Iranian institutions. These terms are an inheritance of the Parthian phase; cf. *supra* at n. 128. For the biblical uses of this term, cf. *infra* n. 140.



that the Armenian princes were less reduced by the Crown than the Iberian. The heads of the princely houses, however, were usually styled *tēr* ('lord'), *tanutēr* ('lord of the house'), or *nahapet* ('patriarch' or 'genearch') — the last two terms, like the Georgian *mamasaxlisi*, are clear survivals of tribal conditions. A principality was called, in its political aspect, *teruṭ'iwn* (signifying not only 'lordship,' but also 'State'), *tanuteruṭ'iwn*, or *nahapetuṭ'iwn*, and, in its territorial aspect, *tun* ('house'), *ašxarh* ('land'), or *gawaṛ* ('canton'), its nucleus being *ostan* (literally, 'threshold,' i.e., 'Court') or *gah/gahoyk* ('seat,' 'throne').<sup>137</sup> Cadets of the princely houses, and of the royal house, were entitled *sepuhk*, the title of the heir to the throne being preceded by the adjective *mec* ('great') or *awag* ('senior').<sup>138</sup>

The feudal aspect of the princely class stemmed, in Armenia as in Iberia, from the attempt of the High Kings to involve the dynasts in the service mechanism of the monarchy. This inevitably implied the fiction of a delegation of sovereignty, to explain from the Crown's point of view the historical 'poly-

<sup>137</sup> Adontz, *Armenija* 435, 451-453, 457-458, 463-466; *Aspect* 141-142. *Tēr* (= κύριος) is derived from the particle *ti-* indicative of divinity (and related to *divus*) and *ayr* ('man,' *divḡg*); its feminine counterpart being *tikin* (*kin* = γυνή); Adontz, *Armenija* 404-405; Meillet, *Altarm. Elementarb.* 209, 210. — *Tanutēr* is composed of the preceding term and of the genitive of *tun* ('house'), the latter being the exact sociological equivalent of the Georgian *saxl*, for which see *supra* n. 89. In the biblical texts it corresponds to *οἰκοδεσπότης* (e.g., Matt. 13.52). — Finally, *nahapet* is a sociological synonym of the preceding; it is variously derived by specialists: either, as an Armenian word, from *nax-* (*πρωτο-*), a derivation by the way of the Iranian *nax* (*ἀρχή*), and from *-pet* (= the Old Pers. *paitiš* = *-αρχης*), as by Hübschmann, *Grammatik* 200; or as a direct importation of the Parthian period, a derivation of the Old Pers. \**nāfapaitiš* ('lord of the family'), as by Adontz, *Aspect* 142; or, finally, as related to the Urartian term *naḫadi* or *nahabi* indicative of the royal succession, as by A. Safrastian, 'The Hūrri-lands,' *Georgica* 4-5 (1937) 263-264. In the biblical texts, it has the meaning of 'patriarch' (e.g., Acts 2.29). — The suffix *-uṭ'iwn* (= *-σύνη*) denotes abstract nouns; Meillet, *Altarm. Elementarb.* 28-29. — The evolution from tribal conditions of the Armenian and Georgian social structure is illustrated by the history of certain social terms, which is one of the adaptation of old terms to new uses. Thus, the Arm. *tun* and the Georg. *saxl* originally meant 'household' and then came to signify 'domain,' 'seignior' and, in the case of the former, also 'country' (= Syr. *bēṭ*); the Arm. *tanutēr* and the Georg. *mamasaxlisi* passed from the sense of 'head of a family/household' to that of 'head of a princely dynasty' and, in the case of the former, also 'head of the State'; finally, the Arm. *azg*, meaning originally 'the entire clan,' came to signify 'the body of the nobles' and even 'the whole nation'; cf. Manandyan, *P'eodal. Hay.* 242.

<sup>138</sup> Adontz, *Armenija* 401-402, 435, 451, 472-476; *Aspect* 142; Marr, 'Étimologija dvux terminov armjanskago feodal'nago stroja,' *Zapiski Vostočnago Oldjelenija Imp. Russk. Arxeol. Obščestva* 11 (1899) 165-174. Like the *vāspuhr* of the Sassanian monuments, *sepuh* is derived from the Old Pers. *viθapuθra* ('son of clan'), and its relation to *viθapaitiš* ('head of clan,' *supra* at n. 38) is perhaps not unlike that of *patricii* to *patres*. The meaning of the Armenian term is a combination of the medieval French *juveigneur* and the modern German *Prinz*.

genetic' sovereign rights of the dynastic aristocracy, and, consequently, also involved the theory of a 'monogenetic' sovereignty.<sup>139</sup> The most important, though not the highest, office imposed upon the princes was, as in Iberia, that of duke or *naxarar*.<sup>140</sup> An additional proof that the Armenian princes were more powerful vis-à-vis the Crown than the Iberian can be seen in the fact

<sup>139</sup> Cf. *supra* at nn. 13-14.

<sup>140</sup> Adontz, *Armenija* 450-454, 458, 467, 489-491; *Aspect* 142; Javaxišvili, *Gos. stroj* 129; Marr, *Ėtimologija*; cf. Karst, *Corpus juris* I/2/1.204 (but cf. I/2/2.68, where the *naxarark'* are said to stand for the dynastic aspect of the Armenian princes!); *supra* at nn. 104-108. The etymology of this term is still far from being definitively settled. For one thing, its proposed Iranian (Old Pers.) prototypes are not known to have existed. It has, thus, been derived either from \**naxadāra* and, consequently, from *nax* (= ἀρχή), as by Benveniste, *Titres* 7; Justi, *Namenbuch* 514-515; and, as a possibility, by Meillet, 'De quelques mots parthes en arménien,' *Revue des Études Arméniennes* 2/1 (1922); — or from \**nājadāra* ('holder of the family'), as by Adontz, *Aspect* 142; Manandyan, *O torgovle* 90; and Meillet, *Quelques mots*. The only Iranian example is a name (epithet?), Nahodares, in Ammianus Marcellinus 14.3. Hübschmann, *Grammatik* 200, though deriving it from *nax*, like the supporters of the above first etymology, seems to consider *naxarar* an Armenian formation along with a large number of other *nax*- words. Marr, in *Ėtimologija* 170-173, regarded the first element of the term to have originally been *nah*- as in *nahapet* and *nahang*. Safrastian would link this term, and also *nahapet*, with an Urartian word; *supra* n. 137. Unlike *išxan*, which abounds in the Bible (both O.T. and N.T.), *naxarar* is seldom found in it. *išxan*, it has been seen *supra* n. 136, is the basic word for 'prince,' 'ruler'; on the other hand, *naxarar* denotes an official: e.g., in Mark 15.43 and Luke 23.50, where it corresponds to βουλευτής, of Esth. 1.3; 8.9; 9.3. It is interesting that it does not render στρατηγός, like the Georgian *erist'av* (*supra* n. 104). That is the function also of *išxan*. The latter term, accordingly, corresponds at once to ἄρχων and, thus, to the Georgian *mt'avar* (for which, see *supra* n. 93), as, e.g., in Luke 24.20; Acts 23.5, and to στρατηγός and, thus, to the Georgian *erist'av*, as, e.g., in Ezech. 23.12, 23; Luke 22.52. This ambivalence of *išxan* is significant. On the other hand, στρατηγός is also found to correspond to zōraglux ('general'), in Acts 16.20, 22, 35, 38, but still to the Georgian *erist'av*. It is difficult to agree with Adontz, *Armenija* 450, that *naxarar* is the sociological equivalent of the Iranian (Pehl.) *šahrdār* or vassal dynast (cf. Christensen, *Iran Sass.* 101-103). Like *erist'av*, it is rather an equivalent of the satrap or the latter's successor the strategus (*supra* at nn. 59-63; *infra* at nn. 207-208), for all the biblical uses mentioned above. By the time of the translation of the Bible into Armenian (following the invention of the alphabet at the beginning of the fifth century), ducal and princely functions had been sufficiently fused for *išxan* to acquire the ambivalence just noted. The introduction of the Iranoid term *naxarar*, at all events, must evidently, have coincided with the passing of the Hellenistic into the Parthian phase. The Roman Empire, it will be seen (at nn. 181, 201-202), exercised for some three centuries suzerain rights over some of the Armenian princely States, and the term by which it designated the rulers of these States was precisely 'satrap,' which stressed the feudal-administrative, i.e., the *naxarar*, aspect of the princes; *supra* n. 118. From the official language of the Roman Empire the term 'satrap' has passed into the vocabulary of modern historians, who delight in using it and its derivative 'satrapal' when speaking of the Armenian princes, without realizing that this manifests their utter unawareness of the double, feudal and dynasticist, character of these princes and, moreover, disregards the dynasticist aspect of it.

that of the latter only some were made dukes, so that the sovereign rights of the rest might be ignored by the Crown, whereas *every* Armenian principality was at the same time a dukedom (*naxararufiwn*) of the Armenian Monarchy. The imposition of feudal forms upon the self-determined dynasticist principalities made of them 'elemental strong fiefs' *par excellence*.<sup>141</sup> As a result of this symbiosis, literary monuments tend to speak indiscriminately of *išxan*, *tanutēr*, or *nahapet*, on the one hand, and *naxarar*, on the other; of *naxararufiwn* and *išxanufiwn*, *tanuterufiwn*, or *nahapetufiwn*; or of *tun* and its feudal counterpart, *nahang*.<sup>142</sup> Social relations as revealed in the Arsacid and later sources are marked by a great complexity, owing, first, to the amalgamation of the two distinct elements, dynasticist and feudal, and, second, to the fact that, as in all feudal societies, these relations were not regulated by abstract legal considerations, but evolved from concrete experience and the balance of conflicting interests. All one can do is to attempt to unravel the threads of dynasticism and of feudalism which, without the benefit of articulate theorizing, must not have been clearly distinguished even by the men of the epoch themselves. The relationship of the king and the princes was expressed by the terms *tēr*, *terufiwn* and *çaṛay*, *çaṛayufiwn*. Here the feudal element manifests itself with clarity and presents a striking parallelism to that of the medieval West, even, as Adontz has shown, to the point of occasional terminological coincidence. The former two terms can indeed express dynasticist overlordship no less than feudal, but the latter two are exact semantic and functional equivalents of *famulus* or 'vassal' and of *servitium* or *obsequium*.<sup>143</sup> The bond between lord and vassal was grounded in a contract implicit in two acts: the oath of fealty (*uxl*), whereby the latter promised faithful service and subordination to the former, in exchange for his assurance of lordship and protection;<sup>144</sup> and a ceremony of investiture with some insignia or symbolic objects.<sup>145</sup>

<sup>141</sup> Adontz, *Armenija* 452, 464-466; Ĵavaxišvili, *Gos. stroj* 115-117. — For the 'elemental fief,' see Coulborn, *Comp. Study of Feud.* 190-197.

<sup>142</sup> Adontz, *Armenija* 451-452, 492. A few examples taken at random from ancient historians must suffice as illustrations. Faustus, 4.3 (77), speaks pleonastically of *naxarark' ew azatk'*, *petk' ew išxank'*, the two middle terms being synonyms designating the lesser noblesse (on which presently) and the two outer terms synonymous designations of the higher nobility. Lazarus, 13 (46, 47), 14 (47, 52) 16 (55), 25 (96, 98), 26 (98), 27 (103, 106) refers to the same group of representatives of the high nobility by the terms *awag*, *awag tanutēr*, *naxarar*, *išxan*, *tanutēr*, *awag sepuh*, *mecamec* (cf. also *supra* n. 133).

<sup>143</sup> Adontz, *Armenija* 459-460 and notes. Cf. *supra* n. 11 for 'fathership' and 'sonship' as expressions of dynasticist subordination.

<sup>144</sup> Adontz, *Armenija* 469-470 and notes. The oath was taken over salt; cf. the oath of the Great King Pērōz as referred to by Procopius, *Bell. pers.* 1.4.9. The concept of homage as a separate act from the oath of fealty does not appear to have existed in Armenia.

<sup>145</sup> Adontz, *Armenija* 465-466 and notes. The insignia included a diadem (*patiw*, literally, 'honor'), a signet ring, and possibly a banner. At the Court of Ctesiphon, the Armenian

This bond entailed definite obligations: military service, Court service, and feudal aids.

The military service of the Armenian princes included, in the first place, appearance before the king on summons at the head of their mounted troops and taking part in his wars (*paterazm* = *ost*) or raids (*aspatak* = *chevauchée*). It was precisely with the number of horse that each princely State was supposed to muster that the precedence which existed among the princes was in part connected.<sup>146</sup> It included, secondly, the duty of guarding some of the king's castles and, thirdly, that of surrendering some of their own castles to be garrisoned by the kings' men.<sup>147</sup> The Court service, too, can be said to fall under three headings, the duty of giving the king advice and of assembling in the royal council; that of presenting themselves before the king and of participating in the life and ceremonies of his Court; and the practice of occupying the higher offices of the Crown resulting in the more important princes' being enfeoffed of them, in addition to the office of duke.<sup>148</sup> Finally, the monetary contributions made by the princes to the king constituted an equivalent of the Western feudal aids.<sup>149</sup>

The vassalage of the princes entailed, moreover, three royal prerogatives: the judiciary rights of the king over them;<sup>150</sup> his right to inflict the pain of forfeiture of life and possessions;<sup>151</sup> and of supervising the princely succession.<sup>152</sup> The first prerogative stemmed from both the dynasticist and the feudal principle. The second and third, though obviously feudal in nature, tended, because of the coincidence of the two régimes, to be applied by the Crown also to the purely dynasticist aspect of the princely group.

Now the princely dependence on the king was grounded in both the *fides* and the *feudum*; in the latter, however, owing to the symbiosis of dynasticism

---

princes were greeted with branches or wreaths. The princely banners bore what appears to have been inchoately heraldic designs; cf. Faustus 4.2 (77). For the insignia cf. also *infra* nn. 202-203.

<sup>146</sup> *Supra* at n. 133; Toumanoff, *Lists* III, IV.

<sup>147</sup> Adontz, *Armenija* 470-471 and notes.

<sup>148</sup> Adontz, *Armenija* 444-448, 467-468, 471 and notes; Manandyan, *P'edol. Hay.* 60-61; my *Lists* I, II. In Armenia, as in Iran, 'la noblesse féodale... est en même temps la noblesse de robe'; Christensen, *Iran Sass.* 25, 258-260, also 107-110. As is clear from the basically fifth-century documents of the Gregorian cycle, princes formed on solemn occasions the *entourage* of the king; and Chosroes II of Armenia (c. 337-342) even decreed, according to Faustus, 3.8, that the more important among them should remain at Court and abstain from taking part in the activity of the royal army, where their contingents were commanded by the High Constable. This was a dead letter, apparently; and Arsaces II (350-367) accepted the presence of the princes with their contingents in the royal army; Faustus 4.2. For an earlier instance, the four kings of Tigranes the Great may be recalled; *supra* at n. 54.

<sup>149</sup> Manandyan, *Probl. ob. stroja* 24.

<sup>150</sup> Adontz, *Armenija* 467.

<sup>151</sup> *Ibid.* 460.

<sup>152</sup> *Ibid.* 464-465.

and feudalism, only partially. It is to be borne in mind that the princes derived their power not only from their sovereign rights, but also from being great landowners and the fact of the symbiosis resulted in several kinds of tenure. In the first place, to repeat, the princes were possessors of dynastic allods, equivalents of the *alleux souverains* or *Sonnenlehen* of the West, designated by the term *hayrenik* ('patrimony').<sup>153</sup> Another kind of tenure was called *k'sakagin*, or 'purchased with money,' and it probably did not differ much from the allods.<sup>154</sup> The dependence of the princes, as holders of these two kinds of domains, was clearly one of *fides* rather than of *feudum*. But there was also the other kind of dependence. It was connected with the third kind of tenure, conditional and limited: the fief or *pargewakan* (literally, *beneficium*). It was the land granted in exchange for service, which the princes occasionally held, as a *dominium utile*, of the king.<sup>155</sup> More especially than with land fiefs this dependence was connected with the office-fiefs, that is, with the Crown offices of which some of the princes were enfeoffed, and with the dukedoms that were held by all of them. Thus the King of Armenia had a double aspect: he was essentially the lord paramount of the federation of dynastic and allodial princes, but at the same time he acquired, through the enfeoffment with office-fiefs, the additional character of the source of sovereign power and he tended to acquire, through the enfeoffment with land fiefs, also that of the sole possessor of the *dominium directum*. Unavoidably, this duality led to some confusion. The sources speak, on occasion, of princes as 'appointed' by the Crown to their principalities.<sup>156</sup> Obviously, as an expression of the feudal principle and as referring to the dukedoms, which happened to be conterminous with the principalities, this is quite correct; but it is not admissible, from the dynasticist point of view, when applied to the princely States. Yet the prevalent functional and terminological ambivalence made such statements possible. However, the feudal terminology proved weaker than the dynasticist reality, and the 'appointment' meant nothing other than confirmation or sanction and followed the accepted norms of genealogical succession. Likewise, the cases of forfeiture recorded in the available sources appear to present the same ambivalence, and also a conflict between the two principles. What the Crown no doubt tended to regard as a punishment of a felonious feudatory, the princes tended to consider rather a retaliatory spoliation of a weaker dynast by a more power-

---

<sup>153</sup> Adontz, *Armenija* 457-458; *Aspect* 142-143. — The investiture with the German allodial *Sonnenlehen* was — as in Armenia, it seems — conferred by a banner (*vexillum*), hence they came to be known also as *Fahnenlehen*; J. W. Thompson, *Feudal Germany* (Chicago 1928) 294 and n. 1.

<sup>154</sup> Adontz, *Armenija* 457; *Aspect* 142.

<sup>155</sup> Adontz, *Armenija* 458; *Aspect* 142.

<sup>156</sup> Adontz, *Armenija* 464 and note.

ful one. At all events, the forfeiture did not infringe upon the rights of lawful heirs, to whom the confiscated domains eventually devolved.<sup>157</sup>

A word must be said here on the system of succession followed in Armenia and in Caucasia in general. The succession was, in the first place, strictly agnatic, but, in default of heirs male, might pass through a woman.<sup>158</sup> In the second place, though this is nowhere specifically mentioned in the available sources, an examination of the Caucasian royal and princely genealogies shows that this agnatic succession was, moreover, strictly patrilineal and followed a mixed pattern. The basic norm appears to have been one of primogeniture, but it was occasionally modified by the by-norm of a limited lateral succession. Accordingly, power passed from father to eldest son, except when, owing to the latter's minority, incapacity, or death *vita parentis*, it might pass to the father's next son or younger brother. Upon the latter's death, the throne might or might not revert — this seems to have depended on the relative ambition and strength of the representatives of the two lines — to the senior line.<sup>159</sup> A distinction, however, ought to be drawn between the princes as sovereigns and the princes as proprietors, between, that is, the princes in their public capacity as rulers of their States, which included non-princely lands held by the free nobles and the half-free peasants, and the princes in their private capacity as owners of their demesnes. In the latter capacity, the prince was merely the administrator of the property belonging jointly to his entire family. In Armenia as in Iberia, this was a survival of the gerontocratic tenure of tribal times; and in this the dynastic aristocracy, including the royal house, did not differ from the lesser nobility.<sup>160</sup> In his capacity of a sovereign, on the other hand, the prince, like the king, stood alone. This duality of political and of tenurial functions, of public and private character, may explain, partial-

<sup>157</sup> Adontz, *Aspect* 143; cf. Ĵavaxišvili, *Gos. stroj* 115-117.

<sup>158</sup> Adontz, *Armenija* 179-198; cf. E. Stein, *Histoire du Bas-Empire* II (Paris/Brussels/Amsterdam 1949) 470-471; J. B. Bury, *A History of the Later Roman Empire* II (London 1923) 345. It was this traditional Armenian system of agnatic succession that Justinian I proclaimed abrogated in Roman Armenia by his Edict 3 of 23 July 535, Novel 21 of 18 March 536, and Novel 118 of 543, and replaced by that of cognatic succession. On the other hand, feminine succession was admitted in Caucasia, upon the extinction of the male line, as witness the changes on the Iberian throne, mentioned *supra* at nn. 68-69, or the passing, in Armenia, of the Gregorid inheritance to the Mamikonids, c. 440; cf. *infra* at n. 188.

<sup>159</sup> See *infra*, Supplementary Note C.

<sup>160</sup> Adontz, *Armenija* 195, 455-456; *Aspect* 143; Manandyan *P'eodal. Hay.* 196-197; *Probl. ob. stroja* 21. In Georgia this system of aristocratic landownership was retained to the end of the kingdom; *supra* n. 89. — Because the private aspects of the princes' existence were endowed with a public character (*supra* at n. 6), the inheritance of princely property, not only the succession to princely power, was achieved without recourse to testamentary dispositions; Adontz, *Armenija* 193-194.



ly at least, the mixed paternal-fraternal pattern of Caucasian succession.<sup>161</sup>

Another manifestation of the feudal principle was found in the diffusion, in diminishing and interdependent degrees, of the rights of government and, to an extent, also of tenurial rights. The princes, dynastic equals that they appear to have been, differed among themselves in rank according to their political weight and to the number of horse each was supposed to provide as part of his military service to the king.<sup>162</sup> But, as feudatories they evinced even greater differences. Their ducal office was not the topmost rung of the feudal ladder. Above the dukes in rank and, what is more important, placed in actual control of some of them, stood the four princes invested with the office of vitaxa or *bdeašx*. Below the princes-dukes, on the other hand, stood, as will be seen, their own cadets (*sepuhk'*) and nobles (*azatk'*), whose dependence on them was not only one of *fides*, but also of *feudum*.

The vitaxae were established by Tigranes the Great and were referred to be Classical writers as the 'four kings,' or tetrarchs, of his *entourage*.<sup>163</sup> Their functions were margravian and the territories they ruled were carved out of border kingdoms in order to serve as bulwarks of the Armenian Monarchy against pressures from beyond. Since all the princely levies, including those of the vitaxae themselves, were under the command of the High Constable (*sparapet*) of Great Armenia, it must be supposed that the dependence of some

---

<sup>161</sup> Justinian I's legal acts make a distinction between the Armenian princes (under the Imperial aegis) as holders of public power and as holders of their private domains. Sometime between 528 and 536, Justinian abolished the autonomous sovereign rights of these princes. The princely States ceased to exist as *civitates stipendiariae* and were converted into integral provinces of the Roman Empire. This concerned the public aspect of the Armenian princely dynasties involved. Then, by legal acts of 535, 536, and 543, the Emperor proceeded to interfere with the manner of succession to the 'genearchic' lands (*supra* n. 158), i.e., to the domains that the princes, now 'mediatized,' held independently of their own sovereign status, in a private capacity. Cf. also Manandyan, *P'eedal. Hay.* 90, for the distinction between the prince as a great landowner and the prince as a seignior of great territories, i.e., holder of political power. Strabo, too, may be presumed to have made the distinction between the public and the private, when he describes — in reverse order here — (a) the administration of private property as carried out by the *πρεσβύτατος* of the family and (b) the succession to the throne of Iberia as going to the *πρεσβύτατος* 'according to kinship and age' (*supra* n. 88). The Greek word is, clearly, used here in two different senses: 'superior in age' in case (a), 'superior in standing' in case (b), the latter superiority being precisely due to genealogical, and not just chronological, considerations. Perhaps, owing to this terminological ambivalence, Strabo found himself, under the influence of sense (a), adding *τε καὶ ἡλικίαν* to the 'senior' of sense (b). Needless to add, this distinction of public and private is a concomitant of civilized existence, though, in the ruling group, the two aspects may meet; *supra* at n. 6.

<sup>162</sup> *Supra* at nn. 133, 146; Toumanoff, *Lists* III, IV.

<sup>163</sup> Toumanoff, *Vitaxae*.

princes on the tetrarchs was of a political, rather than of a strictly military, nature.<sup>164</sup>

The princely cadets, the *sepuhk'*, originally depended on the princes regnant only politically. Tenurially, they were independent, being together with the latter co-possessors of their indivisible dynastic allods. But, with the downfall of the Arsacid Monarchy, infringements began upon the indivisibility of the allodial seigniories, and the practice arose of allotting appanages to the *sepuhk'* out of the communal patrimonies. With this, their dependence on the heads of their houses became tenurial no less than political. Later still, by the ninth century, the *sepuhk'* were known on occasion to transfer their feudal allegiance to other princes, heads of other dynasties.<sup>165</sup> Numerous terms served to designate this dynastic layer of the nobility, in contradistinction to the non-dynastic one of the *azatk'*.<sup>166</sup>

The *azat* nobility was equivalent, semantically as well as sociologically, to that of the Iberian *aznaurn* and had undoubtedly evolved, like it, from heads of small clans and family-heads of tribal times (being thus in part smaller allodialists who had failed to become sovereigns); from the section of the tribal army-people that had remained free; from the war bands of the dynasts of the Heroic Age; and from *déclassé* princely cadets. It was a class of noble landowners directly subordinate to the sovereign rights of the princes and of the king, as Prince of the royal domain of Ayrarat, and at the same time a class of noble warriors, an *ordo equester*, whose subordination to the dynasts was expressed first of all in the duty, which was also the privilege, of serving in the feudal cavalry of their overlords.<sup>167</sup> This gentry class had other obligations towards the princes, which were of the same feudal nature as those of the princes towards the king.<sup>168</sup> It appears legitimate, therefore, to assume that they enjoyed certain minor rights of government on their lands; but the evidence on this point is very scarce.

<sup>164</sup> *Ibid.* For the High Constable, see *infra* at n. 188.

<sup>165</sup> Adontz, *Armenija* 472-476; *Aspect* 142; *supra* n. 138, cf. Laurent, *Arménie* 63-64.

<sup>166</sup> *Supra* nn. 133, 142.

<sup>167</sup> Manandyan, *O torgovle* 91-92, 263; *P'eodal. Hay.* 93; Adontz, *Aspect* 143, 144-145; Grousset, *Histoire* 294; Laurent, *Arménie* 60-61; R. Kherumian, 'Esquisse d'une féodalité oubliée,' *Vostan* 1 (1948-1949) 11-12; *supra* at nn. 97-99; *infra* Supplementary Note D.

<sup>168</sup> It is clear, for instance, from Canon 16 of the local council of Šahapivan (A.D. 444) that *azatk'* acted as judges; N. Akinian (Akinian), ed., *Šahapivani žoļovin kanonerē (Texte und Untersuchungen zur altarmenischen Literatur* 1/2; Vienna 1953) 89: **Եպիսկոպոս ոք կամ երէց կամ ազատ ոք ի դատաւորաց եւ կամ շինական.** Since princes were supreme *seigneurs justiciers* in their States, without any interference from the Crown (Adontz, *Armenija* 467; *supra* at nn. 129-130), the judiciary position of their noble vassals must obviously have been a matter of princely appointment, exactly as the princes themselves held office-fiefs of the king.

There is no indication in the sources that the Armenian Crown ever attempted, as did the Iberian, to ally itself with the *azatk'* against the dynasts; which is still another evidence for the relative weakness of the Armenian Monarchy vis-à-vis the latter. Although some of the *azatk'* must be supposed to have been allodialists, others are known to have held lands, quite feudally, of the princes (and probably also of appanaged *sepuhk'*) in exchange for specified services and in connection with certain immunities. The name of such a noble fief was *xostak* (literally, 'engagement'); its holder was *xostakdar*. This tenure was, as its name indicates, entirely conditional and limited: a *dominium utile*.<sup>169</sup> Accordingly, the case can be envisaged of an *azat* holding a fief of a *sepuh*, who, in turn, held of a *naxarar*, himself the holder of a *pargewakan* of the king, and that, moreover, the *xostak* in question was a fragment of the *pargewakan*. This arrangement, even without the not very certain intermediary degree of the *sepuh*, shows Armenian society to have possessed another feature of feudalism — subinfeudation. The symbiosis of feudalism with dynasticism seems to have made the holding of land-fiefs no less unquestioned hereditary than the holding of office-fiefs.

The *azatk'*, though distinct from and inferior to the dynasts, formed together with them one body — the nobility. Their privileges included personal inviolability before the law, as is attested to by canon 3 of the local council of Shapivani of A.D. 444.<sup>170</sup> Together with the princes, these nobles were wholly distinct from the rest of the people.<sup>171</sup> Their oneness as a class with the dynasts was, further, manifested by the fact that certain derivatives of the term *azat* were used by the ancient writers to designate the entire nobiliary body without distinction between prince and noble knight.<sup>172</sup> But the nobles seldom achieve notice on the pages of the historians, being outshone — exactly as are on the pages of Saint-Simon their counterparts, the simple *gentilshommes* — by more exalted *dramatis personae*.<sup>173</sup>

<sup>169</sup> Manandyan, *O torgovle* 91-92; *Nyuf'er hin Hayastani intesakan kyank'i patmut'yan* II (Erivan 1928) 43-52, 73-74; cf. Kherumian, *Féodalité* 12-14.

<sup>170</sup> Akinean, *Šahapivani kanon*. 74: Եթէ ազատ է եւ զան չէ մարթ հարկանել... Cf. Manandyan, *O torgovle* 92; Kherumian, *Féodalité* 20.

<sup>171</sup> Manandyan, *O torgovle* 92; Kherumian, *Féodalité* 52. — The *loci classici* for what seems to have been a difference in physical appearance are Lazarus 77 (312) and Eliseus 3 (86).

<sup>172</sup> As an instance, Lazarus refers as *amenayn azatagundk' ašzarhis Hayoc'* (13[42]) and *gazatanwoyn* (14[48]) to the group which is elsewhere referred to by him as *awaganin Hayoc'* (13[46]), *amenayn awagac' tanuteranc' ašzarhis Hayoc'* (13[47]), *naxararsn Hayoc'* (14[47]), *yawaganwoyn Hayoc'* (14[48]), *naxarark'd Hayoc'* (14[48]), *naxararsn Hayoc'*, *išxanac'n Hayoc'* (14[51]), *išxanac'n Hayoc'* (14[52]), etc. Faustus, 4.55; 5.1, seems to be using *azatagund* in the same sense; this term was used to designate the noble cavalry of Armenia (including, no doubt, the princes who commanded it); Grousset, *Histoire* 294. For the Armenian nobility in general, see Kherumian, *Féodalité* 7-22.

<sup>173</sup> Cf. Laurent, *Arménie* 60-61.

The rest of the population (*ramikk'*) was the *tiers-état*, the taxable class *par excellence*. It included the urban population: merchants — many of them foreigners, Jews, Greeks, Syrians — and artisans, and the vastly more numerous and less privileged peasants (*šinakank'*). The latter, moving steadily from the conditions of the *coloni*, in which they had found themselves in the Artaxiad period, in the direction of full-fledged serfdom, remained personally free but were attached to the soil and dependent on the noble landlords. This dependence, entered into, like the attachment to the soil, in exchange for the lands tenanted by them, consisted in the *corvée*, various imposts, and military service in occasional levies in mass. It also included their subordination to the political authority of the lords, princely indeed and also knightly. Beneath the free social classes stood the slaves — chiefly war prisoners but also those who sold themselves into slavery — who were not very numerous in Armenia, even in the Hellenistic phase.<sup>174</sup>

Though jejune regarding the lesser noblesse, the national historians, be it repeated, contain ample information of a genealogical, onomastic, geographical, and political nature relative to the dynastic aristocracy. In fact, many of the historians were historiographers of particular princely families.<sup>175</sup> Some of them, moreover, provide us with partial lists of the princes from which

---

<sup>174</sup> For the term *ramik*, as applied to the entire Third Estate, and also for another term, *anazal*, which was used by way of an epithet and is not to be taken in the sense of 'unfree,' but rather in contradistinction to *azat*, see Manandyan, *P'eodal. Hay.* 149, 188-189; *Probl. ob. stroja* 19; Kherumian, *Féodalité* 22; and, for the Iberian parallel of *anazat*, cf. *supra* n. 101. — For the urban population of chiefly foreign traders and local agriculturalists and artisans, see Manandyan, *P'eodal. Hay.* 216-231; *O torgovle* 82-85, 118-119; Kherumian 27-30. Cities had grown out of fortified settlements that had developed in the protecting shadow of castles. — For the peasantry, which was the economic foundation of the socio-political structure of Armenia, see Manandyan, *Ditoľut'gunner hin Hayastani šinakanneri druf'yan masin marzpanut'yan šržanum* (Erivan 1925); *P'eodal. Hay.* 160-161, 188-189, 205-210, 304-319; *O torgovle* 68, 82, 93-94; *Probl. ob. stroja* 21-23, 27; Adontz, *Armenija* 479-487; *Aspect* 150-153; Kherumian 22-26. — Finally, for the slaves, who were used chiefly as domestics and never on a scale comparable to that of the Graeco-Roman world, see Manandyan, *P'eodal. Hay.* 237-240; *O torgovle* 68, 94; *Probl. ob. stroja* 3-12, 19; Kherumian 30-22. The three sources of slavery were: capture in war, purchase, heredity. — Adontz attempted to interpret *ramik* as referring to the princes' serfs (and forgot about the nobles' serfs) and *šinakan* as denoting free peasants; *Aspect* 150-151; cf. Grousset, *Histoire* 294. This, in the light of Manandyan's studies, is incorrect and was no doubt due in part to Adontz's erroneous derivation of the former term; cf. Manandyan, *Probl. ob. stroja* 19. For the Iberian parallels, see *supra* at nn. 100-103.

<sup>175</sup> Accordingly, Faustus, Lazarus, Eliseus, John Mamikonean, Zenobius of Glak were historians of the Mamikonid dynasty; Sebēos, Sapuh Bagratuni (whose work has been lost), Ps. Moses, Lewond, of the Bagratid; the Arcruni dynasty had a family historiographer in Thomas Arcruni and that of Siunia — posthumously — in Stephen Orbelian; cf. Laurent, *Arménie* 84, 90, 143; Kherumian, *Féodalité* 23.

their relative precedence can be inferred.<sup>176</sup> Now, Arsacid Armenia appears divided into some seventy princely States — about half the number of the States included, according to the Urartian sources, in the Vannic empire — held by some forty dynasties. The exact number of the Armenian princes, successors of those early kings, did not, quite naturally, remain stationary, but varied in the course of history, owing to the fact that the outlying princely States occasionally fell away from the Armenian Crown; that several of, especially, the more important dynasties tended to form subsidiary States as secundo-genitures or tertio-genitures; and that, on the other hand, some dynasties would accumulate princedoms, either lawfully through inheritance or investiture, or violently through conquest.<sup>177</sup> Geopolitically, Great Armenia was composed of central and zonal lands, the latter being rather more Armenianized than truly Armenian. The southern semicircle of the zone was composed of three marches: the Syrian, later contained in the Roman province of Fourth Armenia; the Arabian, corresponding to the provinces of Arzanene or Ałdznik', Gordyene or Korchēk', and Moxoene or Mōkk'; and the Median, chiefly the provinces of Persarmenia or Parskahayk' and Adiabene or Nor-Shirakan. The northern semicircle was formed by, in the middle, the Iberian March, conterminous with the province of Gogarene or Gugark', and by a number of outlying principalities south-west and south-east of it. The south-eastern group was comprised of the provinces of Otene or Uti, Artsakh, Caspiane or P'aytakaran, and, between the last two and west of them, Siunia or Siunik'; the south-western group formed the provinces of Tayk' and of Upper Armenia. The central region was composed of the northern cantons forming together the province of Ayrarat, where the domains of the Arsacid royal house were situated, and the southern lands grouped — subsequently — into two provinces, Turuberan in the west and Vaspurakan in the east. The majority of the princely States were conterminous with cantons; a few of them, however included entire provinces.<sup>178</sup>

<sup>176</sup> Toumanoff, *Lists*.

<sup>177</sup> Adontz, *Armenija* 236-297, has established that, contrary to certain exaggerated notions that were due to a misunderstanding of the sources, the number of the princely houses of Armenia was about fifty. He left out of the count, however, some houses that had passed out of the Armenian sphere in the course of the fourth and fifth centuries. See Toumanoff, *Lists* I, V; cf. also Manandyan, *P'eodal. Hay.* 45-46. For the Urartian States, see Adontz, *Hist. d'Arm.* 210-213.

<sup>178</sup> Adontz, *Armenija* 298-321 (the chapter devoted to the 'territorial analysis of the princedoms'); H. Hübschmann, *Die altarmenischen Ortsnamen (Indogermanische Forschungen* 16 [Strasbourg 1904]). — It ought to be noted that the differentiation between the terms 'province' or 'land' (*ašxarh*) and 'canton' (*gawar*) was not observed by the ancient historians prior to the epoch of Justinian I; *ibid.* 240-244. There were, in other words, simply different lands, some larger and containing others — these we may call *ex post facto* 'provinces' — and others, smaller.



14. Before singling out a few historically important dynasties, a word needs to be said about the princely nomenclature. The earliest Armenian literary monuments reveal the existence of a fully developed onomastic system involving the *praenomen* and the *nomen gentilicium*. The princely family names were by origin either territorial or patronymic, though actually the distinction between these two kinds of names was often blurred, owing to the fact that many of the princedoms seem to have derived their names from the patronymics of their ruling houses.<sup>179</sup> Most Armenian names of countries and regions being plural in form — a relic of the tribes and clans of the past to which these territorial units owed their individuality, — the word designating a principality was often the same as the plural of the dynastic surname derived from it or from which it was derived. Some dynasties, moreover, had special family titles peculiarly their own and others were enfeoffed of great Crown offices, and as a result some patronymics were derived from such titles and offices. All the members of a princely house, including its head, might be called simply by their *praenomina* and their common *nomen gentilicium*, their princely status being sufficiently apparent from the latter. More formally, the ruling princes were styled: 'Prince (one of the several terms discussed earlier) of This-and-that land (usually the genitive plural of the toponym), or of Such-and-such a family (the genitive plural of the surname).' The formal way of referring to a princely cadet was to entitle him *sepuh* with the addition of the family name, either in the nominative singular or in the genitive plural.<sup>180</sup>

<sup>179</sup> Adontz, *Armenija* 299 and, for instances, *passim* 298-321.

<sup>180</sup> The following few instances, culled at random from ancient historians, will illustrate the various forms of the nomenclature. (I) Princes (a) Territorial Names: *Andovk Siwni* (Faustus 3.16[55]); *Andovkay iŝxanin Siwneac'* (Fau. 3.11[39]); *iŝxann Siwneac' zVaŝinak* (Fau. 3.9[32]); *Vorot' iŝxann Vananday gawarın* (Fau. 3.13[40]); *zArtawan ziŝxan Vananday* (Fau. 3.14[49]); *Gorut' iŝxann Joroc' aŝxarhin* (Fau. 3.12[40]); *tēr Siwneac' Vasak* (Lazarus 23[92]); *Artaŝir tēr Siwneac' (Bk. Lett. ed. Girk' t'Ifoc'. Metenagruŝiwn nazneac' [Sahak Mesropean Matenadaran 5, Tiflis 1901] 42).* — (b) Gentilitial Names: *Vahan yAmatuni* (Fau. 3.8[31]); *zPargew iŝxann tann Amatuneac'* (Fau. 4.4[81]); *zKarēn ziŝxann Amatuneac' tohmin* (Fau. 3.14[49]); *zAba iŝxann Gnuneac'* (Fau. 3.12[40]); *Vardann Mamikonean tohmin tanutēr* (Fau. 4.18[136]); *Vahan nahapet Amatuneac' tohmin* (Fau. 3.7[28]); *tēr Amatuneac' Vahan* (Laz. 23[92]); *Mangen Amatuneac' tēr (Bk. Lett. 42).* — (II) Cadets: *Hmaekay Mamikonēi* (Laz. 41[158]); *sepuhn Hmayeak* (Laz. 33[134]); *sepuhn Mamikonēic' Vasak* (Laz. 68[268]); *sepuhk'n Vahewunik' (Sebēos 7.79); meci sepuhn Mamikonēic' (Laz. 27[108]); Hamazaspean sepuh m'i Mamikonean tohmēn (Fau. 5.37[246]).* — (III) Princesses: *ztikinn Rŝtuneac' (Fau. 4.59[184]).* — Documents of the sixth century (e.g., Acts of the Council of 555; *Bk. Lett. 74*) indicate that patronymics (in the sense of a name derived from one's father, rather than in that of a *nomen gentilicium*) tended to be used instead of both surnames and titles. Faustus' use of *tan*, *tohmi*, *gawarī*, *aŝxarhi* (genitives of 'house,' 'family,' 'canton,' 'land,' coupled in the above examples with the suffix -n, which is a kind of definite article) may be a stylistic mannerism. Above, the toponym *Vanand* (gen. *Vananday*) is singular in form; *Siwnik'* (gen. *Siwneac'*), plural. The surname derived from the latter is *Siwni*; its plural is



Among the most powerful princes were, of course, the Vitaxae of the four marches. The Syrian, or (as it was then termed) the 'Assyrian,' March was formed of the territory of the former Kingdom of Sophene and comprised the Principalities of Ingilene or Angel-tun, Anzitene or Andzit, and the two Sophenes or Tsop'k', one called 'Greater' and the other 'Shahian.' The dynasties reigning in these four States appear to have all been descended from the Orontids, one-time Kings of Sophene, whom the Artaxiads had dethroned without, evidently, being able to dislodge them. It must have been for this very reason that the Vitaxa of this march appears, as an exceptional manifestation of the Crown's *étatisme*, to have been not a dynast at all, but an official, the Grand Chamberlain of Armenia (*hayr t'agawori*), who controlled the chief fortresses of the region and especially the great fortress of Angl, in Ingilene, formerly Carcathiocerta, the capital of the Kings of Sophene. As a concession no doubt to the dynasticist régime, the Grand Chamberlain was *ex officio* invested with the Principality of Mardpetakan, in the province of Vaspurakan, and so bore the title of *mardpet*. The Arabian March was composed of the territories taken from the Kingdoms of Mygdonia and Gordyene and was placed under the rule of the Vitaxa of Arzanene, another presumable Orontid, styled 'Great Vitaxa,' who commanded the Princes of Moxoene, Corduene or Korduk' (in Gordyene), and of Zabdicene or Tsawdēk' (in Arzanene), as well as others. Of these, the Prince of Corduene, though subordinate feudally to the Vitaxa, enjoyed the exceptional military position of being exempt from the High Constable's command. The Vitaxa of Adiabene controlled the Median March, created with the lands wrested from the Kingdoms of Adiabene

---

identical with the toponym. Thus, 'Prince of Siunia' has the same form as, say, 'Prince of the Amatuni [family/house].' Some houses had both a dynastic and a territorial name (as, e.g., the Kamsarakans of Aršarunik', who were also surnamed 'Aršaruni'); the territorial names of some ended in the suffixes *-ac'i* or *-ec'i* (e.g., *Akēac'i*); while others are not known to have had any surname, territorial or dynastic, but were known as just, let us say, 'Prince of Vanand.' Most dynastic patronymics ended in *-uni*, exactly as most territorial names, so that it is not always possible to tell whether a surname was dynastic or territorial by origin. Some dynastic patronymics ended also in *-ean* (gen. pl. *-eic'*), and so did a few toponyms. For gentilitial titles and hereditary offices, see *infra* at nn. 187, 188, 191, 195. — *Naxarar* appears to have been chiefly used by way of a general description, especially in the plural, as applied to groups of princes, rather than as a specific term that formed part of their particular and official nomenclature. The use of this feudal term is, accordingly, similar to that of the Georgian dynasticist term *sep'ecul* and different to the specific use of the feudal *erist'av*. Here may well be another indication of the difference of emphasis in the feudal-dynasticist symbiosis in Armenia and in Iberia: the dynasticist elements tending to be more concrete in the former, the feudal in the latter; cf. *supra* at nn. 136, 140, 168. On the other hand, *tanutēr* also tended to be used in a generally descriptive rather than precise way, though to a lesser degree than *naxarar*. *Nahapel* appears to have been used only with patronymic surnames.

and Atropatene; whilst the Vitaxa of Gogarene, or of Iberia, also styled 'The Other Vitaxa,' was in command of the 'Moschian,' that is, Iberian March, built with the Georgian conquests of the Artaxiads. These two Vitaxae were also assisted by subordinate princes.<sup>181</sup>

Before the downfall of the Arsacid Monarchy in the fifth century, all the outlying territories, save Tayk', Upper Armenia, Siunia, and Moxoene, had been lost to it. The Syrian March, having first fallen under the aegis of Rome in 297, became definitively a part of the Roman Empire at the end of the fourth century. To its four principalities, two more were added: Balabitenne or Balahovit and Asthianene or Hashteank', in Upper Armenia, on the Arsanias; and thus there came into existence Rome's vassal hexarchy, later to be called Other Armenia — the region of six princely States acknowledging the suzerainty of the Empire.<sup>182</sup> At the same epoch, parts of the Arabian and Median Marches, as well as the province of Caspiane — their princely houses except those that removed to Armenia's central lands, ceasing to exist — passed to Iran; Otene and Artsakh became parts of Albania; and the Iberian March, having already in the first century briefly entered the Georgian world, now once again reverted to Iberia. Under new suzerainty, the House of Gogarene, the sole remaining member of the Artaxiad tetrarchal system, retained its control over much of the territory of the march and continued — alone — to enjoy the dignity of vitaxa.<sup>183</sup>

Armenia so diminished contained only seven of her former fifteen provinces. Three of the limitrophe ones that remained — Tayk', Siunia, and Moxoene — constituted single princely States; the rest were parcelled out into a number of smaller principalities.<sup>184</sup> On the part from of old with the margravian Tetrarchs stood two dynasties, the Bagratids (Bagratuni) and the Mamikonids (Mamikonian), the one ruling cantons in Upper Armenia, Turuberan, and Vaspurakan; the other holding the whole of Tayk' and cantons elsewhere. In the central lands, other dynasties were sovereign. In Ayrarat, besides the Royal House, the Houses of Kamsarakan and Amatuni held sway; in Turuberan, those of Khorkhoruni, Gnuni, Vahnuni — the High Priests of Armenian paganism — and the latter's successors, the Gregorids, who were to be the dynasty of the first chief Bishops of Armenia. In Vaspurakan reigned the Houses of Rshtuni, Andzewats'i, Atrsruni, and Gnuni. Finally, Siunia and Moxoene were ruled by their own, homonymous, dynasties.<sup>185</sup> Of the remaining princes,

<sup>181</sup> Toumanoff, *Vitaxae*.

<sup>182</sup> *Infra* at nn. 201-203; Toumanoff, *Vitaxae* III.

<sup>183</sup> Adontz, *Armenija* 223-225; 230; Hübschmann, *Ortsnamen* 219-233; Toumanoff, *Vitaxae* II, IV, V.

<sup>184</sup> Adontz, *Armenija* 230, 299.

<sup>185</sup> *Ibid.* 122-126, 298-321.

many were in their day equally important, but none perhaps as historically significant, as these.<sup>186</sup>

The Bagratids were Princes of Syspiritis or Sper, with their *ostan* at the castle of Smbatawan (now Bayburt), in the valley of the upper Acampsis on the Georgian confines of Upper Armenia; their original allod, however, was Bagraundene or Bagrewand, south of Ayrarat, which they lost early in their history. Their descent from the Orontid dynasty appears now indubitable, and, in pagan days, they claimed, like other branches of that house, descent from its tutelary solar deity of vegetation and of the dead, Angl. In Christian times, however, this claim was abandoned for another: to be descended, together with most of the Armenian dynasts, from Hayk. Later still, a Hebrew origin was ascribed to them: this version was further elaborated, in the eighth-ninth centuries, into the celebrated legend of their descent from the King-Prophet David of Israel. By the High Kings of Armenia this dynasty was enfeoffed of the offices of Coronant of Armenia (*f'agadir*) and of Guardian of the Caucasian and Tzannic Mountains: a sort of assistant-vitaxa of the north. In addition to these offices, the Bagratids bore a special, gentilitial, title of *aspet*, whence their earliest recorded, though not long-lived patronymic of Aspetuni was derived. Bagadates, Tigranes the Great's strategus and viceroy of Syria, in the years 83-69 B.C., appears to have been the earliest-known member of this family; and it is not devoid of plausibility that both its principal patronymic and its claims to a Hebrew origin were partly connected with the memory of this renowned ancestor. In addition, the Bagratids also held the Principality of Kogovit, with the fortress of Dariunk' (now Bayazıt), their second *ostan*, in southern Ayrarat, and that of Tamoritıs or Tmorik', in Gordyene, and also some territory in Tayk'. It seems that it was only by the end of the Arsacid period that they had come into control of these lands; by then Kogovit and Tmorik' had become parts of an enlarged Vaspurakan, and for a brief period, before losing them to the Artsrunis in the second half of the eighth century, the Bagratids entitled themselves 'Princes of Vaspurakan.' Later still, they were to acquire other princedoms: Moxoene, those of the Mamikonids, and those of the Kamsarakans; and they were to crown their history in Armenia by restoring in their own favor the abeyant monarchy. The dispersion of their States was at once a source of comparative weakness and a guarantee of security in the struggle of imperial expansions.<sup>187</sup>

<sup>186</sup> For the other princes, see Toumanoff, *Lists*.

<sup>187</sup> Toumanoff, *Orontids* II; *Early Bagratids*; Markwart, *Osteuropäische und ostasiatische Streifzüge* (Leipzig 1903) 391-465; 'Die Genealogie der Bagratiden und das Zeitalter des Mar Abas und Ps. Moses Xorenac'i,' *Caucasica* 6/2 (1930); Adontz, *Armenija* 122, 307-308, 400, 402, 405, 411, 415, 447; Grousset, *Histoire* 291-292 and *passim*; Laurent, *Arménie* 83-86 and *passim*. The Bagratids play a leading role on the pages of the ancient historians,

The Mamikonids were the aboriginal Princes of Tayk'; but, early in their history, they acquired a part of Taraun, in western Turuberan, which was controlled by the impregnable castle of Olakan on the Arsanias. Somewhat later, in the fifth century, they inherited the principalities of the patriarchal dynasty of the Gregorids: the remaining moiety of Taraun, with the city of Ashtishat, once the seigniory of the pagan Vahnunis; Bagraundene in Ayrarat; and Acilisene or Ekeleats', in Upper Armenia. This made them the greatest territorial princes of the Armenian Monarchy, ruling a State that nearly sundered it into two halves. In addition to this, the Mamikonids were enfeoffed by the Kings of the office of High Constable of Armenia (*sparapet*), which carried with it the supreme command of all the armed forces of the kingdom, including in the first place the princely cavalry, and thus implied a pre-eminence among all their dynastic *confrères*. But the advent of the Arabs in the seventh century spelled the ruin of the traditionally Romanophile Mamikonids: they suffered ultimately the loss of almost all their dominions and of much of their political weight. They claimed descent from the Emperors of China, but this was apparently inspired by the then prevalent vogue of exotic origins and they must, in reality, have been of Tzannic origin, since the land of the Georgian people of the Tzanni or Lazi lay in the immediate vicinity of Tayk' and since the Mamikonid onomastics, their dynastic patronymic in the first place, betrays a Georgian provenance. The earliest historically ascertained member of this house appears to have been Mancaeus who defended Tigranocerta against the Romans in 69 B.C.<sup>188</sup>

Of the remaining dynasties, the House of Kamsarakan or Arsharuni claimed descent from the Kārin-Pahlav branch of the Iranian Arsacids and held in appanage, in the royal province of Ayrarat, the Principality of Siracene or Shirak and that of Arsharunik' (whence the second surname), with the old royal city of Eruandashat for their *ostan*. At first, their political weight was

---

Agathangelus (and the other parts of the Gregorian cycle), Faustus, Lazarus, Eliseus, Ps. Moses, and (the seventh-century) Sebēos. This note treats of Bagratid history and historiography more briefly than in the case of some other houses, because this matter is treated extensively in *Orontids*; cf. also *Lists*.

<sup>188</sup> Adontz, *Armenija* 124-126, 282-283, 299, 308-311, 370, 402-404, 445, 447; Markwart, *Südarmenien* 67\*-79\*, 290-296; Grousset, *Histoire* 290-291, 641, and *passim* (erroneously, he attributes, p. 290, the hereditary High Constabship also to the Kamsarakans); Laurent, *Arménie* 90-94; Akinean, 'Elišē vardapet ew iwr patmut'iwn Hayoc' paterazmi: Matenagrakan-patmakan usumnasirut'iwn' I, *Handēs Amsōreay* 45 (1931) 427-448; 46 (1932) 784-786; G. Garitte, *Documents pour l'étude du livre d'Agathange* (ST 127 [1946]) 223, 235-236; Hübschmann, *Ortsnamen* 276-278, 286, 325-327, 357-361; H. Scöld, 'L'origine des Mamiconiens,' *Revue des Études Arméniennes* 5/1 (1925) 131-136; K. Mlaker, 'Die Herkunft der Mamikonier und der Titel Čenbakur,' *Wien. Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes* 39 (1932) 133-145; Justi, *Namenbuch* 424-425; Manandyan, *P'eodal. Hay.* 73; my *Lists*. See *infra* Supplementary Note E.

far slighter than their prestige as Princes of the Blood; but the diminution and finally the fall of the Armenian Monarchy in the fourth and fifth centuries enhanced their importance, as their State acquired a quasi-margravian significance on the contracting northern frontier of Armenia.<sup>189</sup> The House of Amatuni, originally dynasts of Artaz near the Caspio-Median lands of the region of lake Urmia (Mantiane), ruled in historical times a principedom in Aragatsotn on the western shore of lake Sevan, the centre of which was the family's chief fortress of Oshakan.<sup>190</sup> The Haykid House of Khorkhoruni ruled over the canton

<sup>189</sup> Faustus 3.11, 16, 21; 4.4, 19; Lazarus 34, 35, 36, 39, 42, 43, 45, 47, 57, 62, 63, 71, 74, 79, 80, 81, 86, 96; Eliseus 3 (98), 5 (129), 6 (151), 8 (250); Ps. Moses 2.27, 28, 42, 71-73, 90; 3.29, 31, 32, 38, 43, 48, 50, 65. — Aršarunik', formerly Eraxsajor = 'Ἀραξηνὸν πεδῖον' of Strabo (11.14.4, 6), from which the family's second surname was derived (cf. *supra* n. 180), contained also the great castle of Artagerk' (Artageras: Strabo 11.14.6; cf. RE 2/1 1302); whereas Širak (cf. RE 3 A/1.282-283 [No. 2]) had in it the city of Ani, which at a later period became the capital of the restored — Fourth — Armenian Monarchy of the Bagratids. See Adontz, *Armenija* 300-303; S. Kogean, 'Kamsarakannerë « teark Širakay ew Aršaruneac », ' *Azgayin Matenardaran* 110 (Vienna 1926); Grousset, *Histoire* 289-290, 332-333; Laurent, *Arménie* 96-97; Hübschmann, *Ortsnamen* 363, 364; Garitte, *Documents* 233-234; F. Tournebize, 'Arscharouniq,' DHGE 4.745. In Ps. Moses, the Kamsarakan cousinship with the Kings of Armenia of the Arsacid line is stressed; cf. 2.72 (208), 2.90 (242). — The princely houses of Abelean, Gabelean, and Hawenuni, of the cantons of the same name, between Aršaruni and Basean, along the Araxes, appear to have been branches of the House of Kamsarakan, as do the Princes Spanduni; Adontz, *op. cit.* 301, 305; cf. my *Lists*,

<sup>190</sup> Faustus 3.8, 14; 4.4; Lazarus 23, 25, 31, 33, 37, 42, 47, 63, 67; Eliseus 2 (55), 4 (119), 5 (129, 137), 8 (250); Ps. Moses 2.57, 77, 84, 85; 3.6, 9, 43, 50, 65; Sebēos 6 (78), 11 (90), 30 (175). — Like the princely houses of the Mardpets, Mandakuni, and Murac'an, the Amatunis must be of Median, i.e., of Caspio-Median or Ma(n)tianian-Mandnaean, origin; Adontz, *Armenija* 303-304, 321, 418-419; Lap'anc'yan, *Xajasa* 140, 136; cf. also, for the largely pre-Iranian Mannaeans, I. Aliev, 'Midija — Drevnejšee gosudarstvo na territorii Azerbejdžana,' *Očerki po Drevnej Istории Azerbajdžana* (Baku 1956) 60-123; Markwart, *Südarmerien* 430-434; Herzfeld, *Arch. Hist. Iran* 11-12. It is interesting that Ps. Moses, 2.57 (184-185), while announcing the Iranian origin of the Amatunis, asserts at the same time that they were of Jewish origin. One may wonder what influence the Bagratid tradition of the same origin (*supra* at n. 187), so dear to him, may have had on this. As is known, the memory of the Urařian kings was fresh in the historical tradition of Arsacid Armenia (*supra* n. 51), and so also could easily have been the memory of some of the neighboring and contemporaneous Median-Mannaeans dynasts (for these dynasts, see, e.g., Aliev, *op. cit.*, 91, 94: the Assyrians styled them 'kings' = *šarrāni* or 'toparchs' = *bēl-āli*). Of these, none was perhaps more entitled to be remembered than the ally of Urařtu, Bagdatti, dynast of Uišdiš, who paid for this alliance by being skinned alive by Sargon II of Assyria in 715/4 B.C. (*Annals* 1.64-65; *Fasti* 1.55-56, in H. Winckler, *Die Keilschrifttexte Sargons* [Leipzig 1889]; cf. Adontz, *Hist. d'Arm.* 97-99, 301; Aliev, *op. cit.* 102-103) and who may be supposed to have indeed been remembered in the region where he had ruled. Now Uišdiš, for all the uncertainty about its precise location (see Manandyan, *O nek. sporn. probl.* 39-47, on this problem and for a critique of Thureau-Dangin and Adontz), was — and this is certain — in the region of lake Urmia-Mantiane, precisely the area where the House of Amatuni originated. Assuming that Ps. Moses had somehow heard of Bagdatti, it could be explained that to his mind at least

of the same name, which was the territory of the last remnants of the Hurrians. From its gentilitial title of *malxaz* the dynasty derived another surname: Malkhazuni, and their State was also known as the Malkhaz-dom.<sup>191</sup> The House of Rshtuni was sovereign in the region of lake Van, over the canton of the same name, the island fortress of Alt'amar, and perhaps the capital of the Vannic empire: Tushpa. The location of their principedom, their recognized Haykid descent, and the derivation of their name from the Urartian royal name of Rusa, all point to the Rshtunis' Urartian origin.<sup>192</sup> The homonymous territory of the House of Andzewats'i, with its chief castle of Kangvar, appears to have been, at least in part, identical with the ancient principedom of Mahk'ert in the Median March; this house, of Median or Medo-Kurdian origin, did not follow the secessionist policy of the Median Vitaxae, but remained in Great Armenia within an enlarged Vaspurakan, becoming subsequently extinct into the House of Artsruni.<sup>193</sup>

the combined notion of the proximity between the Amatuni allod and Bagdatti's land and of the affinity between Bagdatti's name and that of the Bagratid eponym (both indeed derived from the Old Pers. *bagadata*) suggested that the two houses, of Amatuni and of Bagratuni, were, if not of the same ancestry — and he must have been aware of the fact that they did not consider themselves related, — at least of the same ethnic origin. Given Ps. Moses' theory of the Bagratid origin, which included the derivation of 'Bagarat' from a Hebrew name (cf. *Orontids* II), that ethnic origin could only have been Jewish. For the House of Amatuni, see also Grousset, *Histoire* 293; Laurent, *Arménie* 116; Hübschmann, *Ortsnamen* 252, 410; Tournebize, 'Amatouniq,' DHGE 2.990-993; my *Lists*.

<sup>191</sup> Arm. Agath. 112/795 (404), 126/873 (440): *išxann Malxazuŋ'ean tann*; Gk. Agath. 135, 164: ἄρχων, ὁ τῶν Μαλχασίων οἴκου; ἄρχοντα τῶν Μα<λ>κ<α>ζ<ι>των; Gk. Life of St. Gregory 98: γενεάρχης ὁ τῶν Χουρχόρων ὡς ἡγούμενος ἔχων τὴν ἀρχὴν τὴν καλουμένην Μαλχαζόβη; cf. 172: τὴν Μαλχαζάν; Faustus 3.12; 4.11; 5.38; 43; Lazarus 25, 34, 35, 36, 39, 64, 65, 68, 69; Eliseus 2 (55), 3 (95), 4 (118), 5 (129), 6 (151, 155); Ps. Moses 1.12; 2.7; 3.9. See also Adontz, *Armenija* 313, 331-332, 415, 440, 490; Safrastian, *Hurri-lands* 259-267; Akinean, *Elišē* 472-479, 789-790; Justi, *Namenbuch* 188-189; Hübschmann, *Ortsnamen* 330, 435; Garitte, *Documents* 223, 239. — According to Ps. Moses, 2.7, the Prince-Malxaz was enfeoffed of the command of the bodyguard of the Kings of Armenia, which was recruited from his subjects; cf. my *Lists*.

<sup>192</sup> Arm. Agath. 112/795 (404), 126/873 (440): *išxann Rštuneac' (ašxarhin)*; Gk. Agath. 135, 164: ἄρχων τῆς Ρουσινίων χώρας; τὸν ἄρχοντα Ρεστουνιτῶν; Gk. Life of St. Gregory 98; ὁ τῶν Ρουστωνίων τοπάρχης; Faustus 3.7, 10, 16, 18; 4.4, 11, 59; 5.37; Lazarus 25; Eliseus 2 (55), 8 (251); Ps. Moses 2.8, 85; 3.6, 15; Sebēos 28 (156), 29 (161, 167), 30 (176), 32 (184-188), 33 (194). See also Adontz, *Armenija* 315, 321; Grousset, *Histoire* 292, 296-304; Laurent, *Arménie* 89-90; Hübschmann, *Ortsnamen* 339-340; Garitte, *Documents* 231-232. According to Ps. Moses, 2.8, the Princes Rštuni, those of Golt'n or Colthene, and those of Siwnik' belonged to the same line of the Haykid dynasty; cf. my *Lists*.

<sup>193</sup> Also written *Anjawac'i*. Faustus 2.12; 4.11; 5.6, 32; Lazarus 23, 25, 42, 47, 70; Eliseus 5 (129), 8 (250); Ps. Moses 2.8, 62; 3.39; Zenobius, *Hist. Tarawn* (ed. Venice 1889) 25. See also Adontz, *Armenija* 321; Markwart, *Südarmerien* 359-389, 509-516; Grousset, *Histoire* 334-336; Laurent, *Arménie* 97; Hübschmann, *Ortsnamen* 342-343; my *Lists* and *Vitaxae* II (for Mahk'ert); Tournebize, 'Antzevatsiq,' DHGE 3.884-885.



The Artsrunis and the Gyunis were branches of the Orontid dynasty, but, following the Conversion of Armenia, they gave up the pagan Orontid tradition of the descent from the god Angl, adopting instead a genealogical claim that traced them back to King Sennacherib of Assyria. Both, or at least the Artsrunis, were transplanted by the Kings of Armenia away from Sophene to the Median frontier. There, one of the Artsrunid branches held the dignity of Vitaxa of Adiabene; another, the principalities of Zarehawan, Zarewand and Her; still another, the youngest it seems, ruled in Greater Albak with the castle of Hadamakert for *ostan*. This branch, of the Artsrunis proper, rose in the fifth century to a position of especial prominence, through the acquisition of Mardpetakan, which princely State, the most powerful one in Vaspurakan, had prior to this been the princedom of the Caspio-Median Mards and then (as has been seen) the appanage of the Grand Chamberlains of Armenia. Later still, at the end of the eighth century, the entire province of Vaspurakan passed under Artsrunid rule, and, by the tenth century, it became a kingdom.<sup>194</sup> The Gyunis, who reigned north of lake Van and in the cantons of Berkri and of Aliovit and over the city of Archesh, were enfeoffed of the office-fief of Seneschal of Armenia (*hazarapet*). In feudal-dynastic Armenia this headship of the civil administration of the realm carried very much less weight than belonged in the Sassanian State to the Iranian counterpart of this office.<sup>195</sup>

<sup>194</sup> Arm. Agath. 112/795 (404): *išxann Arcruneac'*; Gk. Agath. 135: *ἀρχων, ὁ Ἀσουργωνῶν*; Gk. Life of St. Gregory 98: *ὁ τῶν Ἀρτζ<ρ>οννίων ἐξουσιαστής*; Faustus 3.18; 4.14, 58, 59; 5.38, 43; Lazarus 23, 25, 30, 33, 35, 39, 42, 47, 70; Eliseus 2 (55), 5 (129), 6 (151, 156), 8 (250, 251); Ps. Moses 1.23; 2.7, 29, 35; 3.29, 39, 48, 65; Sebēos 11 (90), 18 (104), 23 (121, 124); Zenobius 25, 27, 30. See also Toumanoff, *Orontids* I. 9, 11-15; *Lists*; Adontz, *Armenija* 319-320, 321, 413-415, 490; Justi, *Namenbuch* 416; Grousset, *Histoire* 292-293, 643, and (for the subsequent history of the house, *passim*; Laurent, *Arménie* 83, 87-89, and *passim*; Markwart, *Eranšahr* 175-178; *Südarmenien* 79\*-96\*, 210 n. 3 (210-212), 390-391 509-516; Tournebize, 'Arzrouni,' DHGE 3.1627-1630; Hübschmann, *Ortsnamen* 344, 338: the medieval Armenian geographers distinguished between two neighboring cantons: Zarehawan and Zarewand, which was always coupled with Her. This distinction appears somewhat artificial in the face of both etymological identity and geographical adjacency. Ps. Moses, 2.7, would ascribe to this house the hereditary office of Eagle-bearer (*arciw-uni*); but this is only an instance of his fanciful etymologizing. The only authentic reference to the eagle-banners of Armenia is in Faustus 4.2, and it connects them with the Mamikonid High Constables. No doubt the anti-Mamikonid Ps. Moses attempted here, as it were, to kill two birds with one stone: explain the name of Arcruni and deprive the Mamikonids of at least some of their privileges. It is strange that Markwart, *Eranšahr* 178 n. 4, should have so accepted Ps. Moses as to suggest that possibly the Arcrunis were High Constables before the Mamikonids. There is nothing to support this view. — For the possible Arcrunid origin of the Eastern Emperor Leo V, see Adontz, 'Sur l'origine de Léon V, empereur de Byzance,' *Armeniacia* 2 (1937) 1-10; Markwart, *Südarmenien* 210 n. 1.

<sup>195</sup> Faustus 3.12; 4.2, 11; Lazarus 23, 39, 47, 68, 69, 74; Eliseus 3 (90), 5 (129), 6 (156, 173), 8 (250); Ps. Moses 1.23; 2.7, 19; 3.43; Sebēos 29. See also Adontz, *Armenija* 304, 321,

The Houses of Moxoene and of Siunia were the aboriginal dynasties of these lands. The former, of whose origin we know little, soon became extinct and Moxoene passed to the Bagratids.<sup>196</sup> The latter, recognized as a Haykid branch, flourished and rose to the enjoyment of a still greater prominence. Before the end of the Arsacid period, the Siunis reached the level of the Bagratids and the Mamikonids, where they were joined by the Artsrunis. The shrinking of the Armenian realm gave to Siunia the added importance of an Iranian march. But, already in the fourth century, a Prince of Siunia succeeded albeit momentarily, to the honors and domains of the Vitaxae of Arzanene. Considerably later, in the tenth century, this house, like the Bagratids and the Artsrunis before it, acquired the royal dignity. Of all the States that remained in the Armenian orbit after the end of the Arsacid period, Siunia, which long retained its own language, was the least Armenianized and most separatist.

---

445-446, 490; Grousset, *Histoire* 293, 333; Laurent, *Arménie* 97; and (for the Orontid origin) my *Orontids* I.9, 11-15; *Lists*. The canton of Berkri lay in Vaspurakan; that of Aļiovit, in Turuberan. The hereditary office-fief of this house was that of *hazarapet*; Faustus 4.2. This was an office instituted (no doubt in the Parthian period) in imitation of the Iranian office of the same name: *hazārbaδ*. The name was derived from the Old Pers. *hazārāpaitiš*, which in Achaemenian days denoted the office of Commander of the Great King's bodyguard or Chiliarch (for this is what the Iranian term literally means) of the Greeks; Ehtéham, *Iran Achém.* 67, 69; Christensen, *Iran Sass.* 113. In Sassanian Iran, *hazārbaδ* designated something quite different, however: the office of Prime Minister or Head of civil administration, also known as *vuzurg-framandār*, the prototype of the Grand Vizier; Christensen 113-116 (in the last years of the Sassanid empire the name *hazārbaδ* denoted once again the head of the bodyguard; 395); Herzfeld, *Paikuli* 188. According to Theophylactus, 3.18, the competence of this office concerned τὰς πολιτικὰς φροντίδας. For its Armenian counterpart, see Adontz, *Armenija* 445-446, 468, 469. Because of the great independence of the Armenian nobility, princely as well as knightly, the chief concern of this office was with the *tiers-état* and particularly the peasantry. In biblical texts, *hazarapet* corresponds to ἐπίτροπος (e.g., Luke 8.3; 2 Mac. 11.1; however, the ἐπίτροπος of Matt. 20.8 is rendered by *gawarapet*). The first-century Iberian inscriptions from Armazi reveal the existence of the office of ἐπίτροπος in the Kingdom of Iberia; cf. my *Vitaxae* § 19. This Iberian office was called in Georgian *ezos-mojǵuari* or 'Master of the Court'; cf. A. Šaniĵe in *Mitteilungen d. Akademie d. Wiss. d. georgischen S.S.R.* 2, 1-2 (1941) 181-187. A comparison with Iberia will also show that the *spaspet* (*supra* at n. 105) combined the powers of the *sparapet* with some of those of the *hazarapet*, thus making the Iberian Crown more powerful than the Armenian in relation to the princes. Ps. Moses, 2.7, ascribes to the House of Gnuni the hereditary Butlership of Armenia and — somewhat paronomastically, it would seem — derives its name from *gini-uni* (*gini*- 'wine'); but he does not know of their other office. Possibly the latter office included the functions of the former. (Adontz in one place [*Armenija* 468] would render *hazarapet* by 'Chancellor' and *sparapet* by 'Seneschal'.)

<sup>196</sup> Arm. Agath. 112/795 (404): *išxann Mokac' ašxarhin*; cf. 126/873 (440); Gk. Life of St. Gregory 98: ὁ τῶν Μοκασῶν σατράπης; Lazarus 23, 25, 27, 39, 70; Eliseus 2 (55), 6 (151); Ps. Moses 2.8; 3.43, 55; Sebēos 30 (175); Zenobius 26, 30. See also Adontz, *Armenija* 299; Hübschmann, *Ortsnamen* 254-255, 330-333; Garitte, *Documents* 225; Markwart, *Südarmenien* 495-500 (for the Bagratids of Moxoene); Schachermayer, 'Moxoene,' RE 16/1.409; my *Lists*.

Ethnically and linguistically related to the Albanians, the Siunians often made a common stand with them against Armenian claims.<sup>197</sup>

15. The political weight of the Caucasian princely States can be estimated by examining their international position and their military might. The geo-political self-sufficiency of these principalities, as has been pointed out earlier, made itself manifest in the facility with which they passed, while retaining their individuality and autonomy, from one overlord to another. In this way, the Vitaxae of Gogarene exchanged, in the first century, the suzerainty of the Armenian Crown for that of the Iberian, and the princes of the Syrian and the Arabian March passed to Rome, in 297, through the cession by the Great King, then overlord of the Armenian kingdom. Then, in the years 337-342, the Vitaxa of Arzanene, or of the Arabian March, attempted to transfer his feudal allegiance to the Great King; and in 363 a part of the Syrian and the whole of the Arabian March reverted to Iran, the princes themselves accepting the suzerainty of the Great King instead of the still lingering one of the King of Armenia. In this, the Median and the Iberian March, as well as the princes of the Caspian and Median frontier followed them.<sup>198</sup> In 377/8, the number of the princes of the Roman obedience was increased to six through the addition of two States of southern Upper Armenia.<sup>199</sup>

Now, the princes of the Median and Caspian lands soon disappeared from history, and it is impossible to establish the character of their relations with

<sup>197</sup> Arm. Agath. 112/795 (404): *išxann Siwneac' ašxarhin*; cf. 126/873 (440); Gk. Agath. 135, 164: *ἀρχων τῆς Συνιστῶν χώρας*; *τὸν ἀρχοντα Συνιστῶν*; Gk. Life of St. Gregory 98: *ὁ τῶν Συνίων φύλαρχος*; Faustus 3.9, 11, 16, 21; 4.4, 15, 58; 5.42, 43; Lazarus *passim* Eliseus 2 (54), 3 (82), 5 (128), 7 (176, 178), 8 (250); Ps. Moses 1.2; 2.63; 3.18, 22, 26, 28, 41, 43, 46, 54; Sebēos 6 (76, 78), 11 (90), 13 (92), 30 (173), 35 (227, 228, 233), 38 (243); Zenobius 26, 27, 29, 35, 43-44, 46, 48. See also Adontz, *Armenija* 220-221, 274-276, 299, 421-423, 490; Grousset, *Histoire* 291, 645, and (for the subsequent history of this house) *passim*; Laurent, *Arménie passim*; Justi, *Namenbuch* 426-427; Hübschmann, *Ortsnamen*; 263-266, 347-349; Markwart, *Eranšahr* 120-122; Garitte, *Documents* 235; Ališan, *Sisakan* (Venice 1893); Brosset, *Histoire de la Siounie par Stéphanos Orbélian, traduite de l'arménien*, 2 vols. (St. Petersburg 1864, 1866); Toumanoff, *Lists*. — The name of the province of Siwnik' may go as far back as the *Šuini/Šiunt-(i)ni* of the Urartian records; Adontz, *Hist. d'Arm.* 225 n. 3. It is called *Σαυνία* by Eusebius (*Praepar. evang.* 6.10.31; cf. Adontz, *Armenija* 421 n. 4; Markwart, *Südarmenien* 77 n. 1) and *Σαυνίτις* by Strabo (11.14.5: *Φαυνίτις*, cf. Adontz, *loc. cit.*; Markwart, *op. cit.* 78 n. 1 [abandons his earlier identification of Φ. with the canton of Apahunik', but does not quite accept that with Siwnik']; Hübschmann, *Ortsnamen* 210, 239); its people, *Σουνιταί* by Procopius (*Bell. pers.* 15.1). Its other name is of Iranian origin: *Sisakan*, which first appears in the work of Zacharias Rhaetor, in the sixth century: the *Prim. Hist. Arm.*, Agath., Faustus, Lazarus, Eliseus do not know it, but Ps. Moses does; cf. Adontz, *op. cit.* 421 n. 3; Hübschmann 263-266.

<sup>198</sup> Toumanoff, *Vitaxae*; Adontz, *Armenija* 222-230.

<sup>199</sup> *Ibid.* 44-45.

the Iranian empire. But in 428, most of the remaining Armenian princes transferred their vassal obligations from the King of Armenia to the Great King. This, as will be seen, was the end of the Arsacid Monarchy of Great Armenia. The status of these princes of the Iranian obedience is well known. It was in no way altered in the transaction and remained exactly the same as before. The only change was precisely that, instead of having the Arsacid King of Armenia, they now had the Sassanid emperor of Iran as their suzerain. Their obligations remained the same; their rights rather increased, for the new overlord reciprocated their military service with financial subsidies. From the point of view of the Iranian empire, accordingly, the Armenian princes must have belonged to the category of the *šahrdārān* or sovereign vassals. Precisely the same legal situation was repeated when, in 580, the Iberian princes followed the example of the Armenian.<sup>200</sup>

The legal status of the Armenian princedoms in the Roman Empire is also well known. There were two groups of princely States: the Hexarchy of Other Armenia — the *satrapiae* or the *gentes-ἔθνη* — and the principalities contained in the portion of Armenia which devolved to the Empire after the partition of 387 (on which later) and which was called Inner Armenia. All these States belonged to the category of *civitates foederatae*, that is, of autonomous polities which were bound to the Empire, not as a consequence of a conquest, but in virtue of an agreement or treaty — a *foedus non aequum* — and which thus owed their sovereign rights to no concession on the part of the protecting power. These States, accordingly, enjoyed full immunity from the Imperial taxation, Imperial garrisons, and the Imperial administration; and their duties towards the Empire consisted in a surrender of foreign policy and in the obligation of military assistance: in fact, precisely the same privileges and obligations as had been theirs under the Armenian Crown and as belonged to their compeers in relation to the Crown of the Sassanids. It may be added that the latter princes and those of Inner Armenia were placed under the supervision of their suzerains' viceroys — the Iranian *marzpān* and the Roman *comes Armeniae*, respectively. The Hexarchs, on the other hand, were left entirely to themselves.<sup>201</sup> In their case, moreover, it is known that they were — upon accession undoubtedly — invested by the Emperor with the insignia of their dignity, which included royal vestments and the red boots 'of the sort (writes Procopius, to whom this information is due), which only the Roman Emperor and

<sup>200</sup> Cf. Adontz, *Armenija* 277-279, 471; Grousset, *Histoire* 191, 287-289, 293; Laurent, *Arménie* 67-70. For the *šahrdārān* see Christensen, *Iran Sass.* 101-103.

<sup>201</sup> Adontz, *Armenija* 28-45, 91-126; K. Güterbock, *Römisch Armenien und die römischen Satrapien im 4-6. Jahrhundert* (Königsberg 1900); Lehmann-Haupt, *Satrap* (XIV: 'Die römische Satrapen') 181-186; Hübschmann, *Ortsnamen* 225-228.

the Great King are permitted to wear.<sup>202</sup> Similar insignia were sent by the Emperors, in the sixth century, to the Kings of Lazica (West Georgia).<sup>203</sup> In other words, the princely vassals of the Roman Empire enjoyed the status of minor, that is, dependent kings. Since the Roman government cannot be seriously suspected of inventing new royal honors for client rulers, or even of enhancing those already claimed by them, and since the Hexarchs were not more important, and many of them were less important, than many other Armenian princes, it can be assumed that these honors were inherent, and so internationally recognized, in the Armenian, and Caucasian, princely status.

It has been possible to calculate that the approximate number of troops, that is, feudal cavalry levies which the Arsacid Monarchy of Armenia was able

<sup>202</sup> *De aed.* 3.1 : σύμβολα μέντοι αὐτῶν πρὸς τοῦ Ῥωμαίων βασιλέως ἐδέχοντο μόνον. ἄξιον δὲ τὰ σύμβολα ταῦτα δηλῶσαι λόγῳ, ἐπεὶ οὐκέτι ἐς ἀνθρώπον ὄψιν ἀφίεται. χλαμὺς ἡ ἐξ ἐρίων πεποιημένη, οὐχ ὅλα τῶν προβατίων ἐκπέφυκεν, ἀλλ' ἐκ θαλάσσης συνειλεγμένων. πίννονς τὰ ζῶα καλεῖν νενομίκασιν, ἐν οἷς ἡ τῶν ἐρίων ἔκφυσις γίνεται. χρυσῷ δὲ ἡ τῆς πορφύρας κατηγήλειπτο μοῖρα, ἐφ' ἧς εἴωθεν ἡ τῆς ἀλουργίδος ἐμβολὴ γίνεσθαι. περόνη χρυσῇ τῇ χλαμύδι ἐπέκειτο, λίθον ἐπὶ μέσης περιφράττουσά τινα ἔντιμον, ἀφ' οὗ δὴ ὑάκινθοι τρεῖς χρυσαῖς τε καὶ χαλαραῖς ταῖς ἀλύσεσιν ἀπεκρέμαντο. χιτῶν ἐκ μετάρξης ἐγκαλλωπίσμασι χρυσοῖς πανταχόθεν ὠραῖσμένους ἃ δὴ νενομίκασιν πλούμια καλεῖν. ὑποδήματα μέχρι ἐς γόνυ φοινικοῦ χρώματος, ἃ δὴ βασιλέα μόνον Ῥωμαίων τε καὶ Περσῶν ὑποδεῖσθαι θέμις. Cf. Adontz, *Armenija* 108-109. — The fabric woven of the silky beard of the mollusc, called *pinna* or *pinnus*, was highly prized as material for ceremonial vestments, both lay and ecclesiastical. Thus, in 851, Pope Leo IV wrote to Sardinia asking for *lana marina*, *quod nos usu nostro pinnino dicimus*, adding 'quia nostris pontificalibus vestimentis valde nobis necessaria videtur, eo quod frequenter in festivitatibus sollemnibus eiusmodi coloris aut lanae nos optimatesque nostri induimur vestimentis'; cf. P. Salmon, *Étude sur les insignes du Pontife dans le rit romain* (Rome 1955) 34. — For the significance of the gold ornaments of the above garments, see the following note.

<sup>203</sup> Malalas, *Chron.* (CSHB) 413; *Chron. Pasch.* (PG 92) 861; Theophanes, *Chron.* (PG 108) 393; Agathias 3.15. These sources amplify the data of Procopius by indicating that the replacement of the purple by the gold on the mantle and the gold πλούμια of the tunic denoted the royal character of these garments. The Kings of Lazica are said additionally to have received a royal crown, a mitre, a belt, and to have borne an imperial effigy on both the mantle and the tunic. But their mantle, instead of being made of *pinna*, was of (white) silk. — Faustus, 5.38 (248), describes the vestments (and also other gifts, such as a tent, tapestries, and gold vases for the table) sent by the Great King to a Mamikonid prince. They consisted of a royal garment and hermine (garment of hermine?) (*zl'agaworakan patmučann, samoyr...*); two diadems (*patiwk'*), one of gold and silver for the helmet, the other for the head; and ornaments to adorn the chest, such as are worn by kings (= πλούμια?). According to Eliseus, 7 (177), the attire of a Prince of Siwnik' included a diadem (*patiw*), a gold-embroidered tiara (*xoyr*), a gold belt with precious stones, a collar, pendants, and a fur mantle. The crown of pearls and pendants are mentioned among the princely regalia by Ps. Moses 2.7, 47; and Stephen Orbelian, 4.7, relates that those of the House of Siwnik' contained red boots, a collar of pearls, a gold sceptre, and a silver throne. Finally, a diadem, a ring, and a banner were used in the investiture of every Armenian prince by his suzerain the king; *supra* n. 145.



to muster was between 70,000 and 120,000. After the fall of the Monarchy and the diminution of the Realm, the number declined to some 30,000. Later still, under the aegis of the Caliphate, it descended to some 15,000.<sup>204</sup> There are, moreover, some data scattered in the works of the historians that relate to the number of troops raised on occasion by different princes. Thus, it is known that in the Arsacid period the greater among them could muster from 1,000 to 10,000 horse: whereas, after the downfall of the Monarchy, the Mami-konids, for instance, are reported to have got together some 3,000 horse, and the Houses of Artsruni and Khorkhoruni 2,000 each.<sup>205</sup> Finally, there is the evidence of the document known as the Military Register, a catalogue of the military potential of the Armenian princes, of the end of the Sassanian period. According to it, the Houses of Andzewats'i, Artsruni, Bagratuni, Khorkhoruni, Mamikonean, Moxoene are put down as contributing each a contingent of 1,000 horse; the Kamsarakans are put down for 600, and the Gnunis for 500. The lowest number of horse furnished by a princely house was 100. On the other hand, the Princes of Siunia, who after the end of the Arsacid Kingdom acquired a quasi-margravian position on the Iranian border, raised 9,400 horse. It is also clear from the Register that the average number of horse formerly raised by the Vitaxae, as well as by the Mardpet, was 4,000.<sup>206</sup> Generally speaking, 1,000 troops appears to have been the average contribution of the more prominent princes. In view of this, it seems very likely that, when Pliny spoke of the 120 *strategiae* or *praefecturae* of the Armenian Monarchy of his day,<sup>207</sup> he must have had in mind the feudal dukedoms, being aware in one way or another of two facts: that the average number of horse raised by individual prince-dukes was indeed 1,000 and, at the same time, that the sum total of the princely cavalry in the royal service was 120 times that number. It was over-simplifying the picture, to be sure, but a very natural thing to do. In this case, the term *στρατηγός* first met with under Tigranes the Great must be regarded as indeed a rendering of *naxarar*; and the fact of the Greek term's appearance at that time supports the view, expressed earlier, that the introduction of the feudal régime in the dynastic society of Armenia took place under the Artaxiad dynasty.<sup>208</sup>

<sup>204</sup> Adontz, *Armenija* 286-288.

<sup>205</sup> *Ibid.* 288-289.

<sup>206</sup> See Toumanoff, *Lists* IV.

<sup>207</sup> *Supra* at n. 65.

<sup>208</sup> *Supra* at nn. 59-65. The complete fusion of ducal and princely functions in Armenian society (*supra* at nn. 140-142) and the basic character of the latter must account for the fact that to the mind of the Armenians of the Arsacid period the military aspect of the prince-dukes was an expression only of their dynastic character. Some five centuries separate the beginnings of the Artaxiad period, when the office of strategus was presumably introduced in Armenia (and some three centuries separate the time when the elder Pliny wrote), from the epoch of the rise of national Armenian literature, following the invention of the alphabet on the threshold of the fifth century. This long span must also be taken into con-



It would be intensely interesting to investigate the dimensions of the Armenian princely States, but this is made well-nigh impossible by the uncertainty regarding the exact boundaries of most of them. Some frontier lines, however, are ascertainable. It is thus possible to estimate, by casting a glance at any historical map, that, for instance, the area of the Arsacid Kingdom of Great Armenia, prior to its diminution, was approximately 112,000 sq. miles. Likewise, the Artsrunid State of Vaspurakan covered roughly 20,000 sq. miles, while the Syrian March amounted to under 10,000. Consequently, the average area of each of the four principalities of that march — comparatively ordinary ones in size — can be set at some 2,500 sq. miles, approximately that of the Grand Duchy of Luxembourg of today.

Finally a word — the subject will be taken up in some detail in another part of this work — on the significance of the Armenian princes from the ecclesiastical point of view. Following the conversion of the country, on the threshold of the fourth century, the Church in Armenia adapted its territorial organization to the pattern of Armenian society. Instead of episcopal sees coinciding with great urban centres, as in the Roman Empire, we find here episcopal sees made to coincide with all the important princely States. Accordingly, practically every principality had its own bishop, who bore the same territorial title as the prince: 'Bishop of the Mamikonids,' 'Bishop of Siunia,' etc.<sup>209</sup>

16. No picture of Armenian society in the Arsacid and the subsequent medieval period would be complete without at least a passing reference to the ethos of its most representative stratum, the nobility.<sup>210</sup> The two most salient characteristics of this entire class can be said to have been pride and prowess. The numerous instances of these characteristics, as found on the pages of the historians, relate, however, almost exclusively to members of its princely layer. Their pride, more particularly pride of birth, their memories of common origin — natural *Ebenbürtigkeit* — with the Crown and of their anterior status as sovereigns, made it impossible for the princes to regard the King of Armenia as anything more than a *primus inter pares*; all this rendered their subordination to him precarious and made themselves extremely prone to rise in arms against him.<sup>211</sup> Among themselves, all this was conducive to feudal warfare,

---

sideration in order to appreciate the fact that the *išxan* of the Armenian biblical texts (and also another term meaning 'general') is made to correspond to the *στρατηγός* of the Greek texts, while the *naxarar* of the Biblical texts, though indeed denoting *administrative* functions, appears devoid of all military connotation; cf. *supra* n. 140.

<sup>209</sup> To be discussed in a later study.

<sup>210</sup> See the excellent summary of the spirit of the Armenian nobility in Kherumian, *Féodalité* 34-56.

<sup>211</sup> Cf. Kherumian, *op. cit.* 42-51. Thus, Manuel, Prince of the Mamikonids, defeated King Varazdat of Armenia in the battle of Karin, and in a single combat that followed it, drove

with which Armenian history is replete. On a milder level, it implied a constant preoccupation with family history<sup>212</sup> and, perhaps to an even greater degree, with the problems of precedence. Accordingly, a complex system of precedence was evolved among the Armenian princes which the Court of Armenia and — no less — the Court of Iran were careful to respect and of which the slightest infringement might lead to armed conflicts.<sup>213</sup> Yet this sentiment of pride was often combined with one of touching loyalty to the king.<sup>214</sup>

The prowess of the princes and of the nobles was inherent in a knightly society spending most of its time, heavily armored upon armored horses, in warfare.<sup>215</sup> It was the circumstances of geography and history that made this so, not the choice of the Armenian nobility; left to themselves, they might, we may be sure, have divided their energies between the chase and the arts. All the virtues and all the vices of a warrior class were theirs to the full. But, under the molding influence of Christianity, these warrior virtues flowered forth into what is one of the loveliest and most spiritual blossoms among all the lay achievements of man — chivalry.<sup>216</sup> Notable, too, in this connexion

---

him out of the kingdom, and took over the regency, A.D. 377/8. Before relating the armed conflict between them, Faustus records an exchange of messages — Thucydidean, no doubt, yet, in the best tradition of the historian, illustrative of reality — in which Manuel recalls to the King the past services of the Mamikonids to the Arsacid royal house and then adds: ‘we have never been your vassals (*carayk’*), but your comrades (*ēnkerk’*), and superior to you (*i veray k’am zjez*), for our ancestors were Kings of the land of China (*čēnac’*);’ Faustus 5.37 (244); cf. also Grousset, *Histoire* 154-156. For a similar attitude of another Mamikonid towards the Great King, see Sebēos 3 (60-68); cf. Grousset, *op. cit.* 253-255. Ps. Moses, 3.55, gives other instances involving members of the Houses of Moxoene, Arcruni, and Gardman and a Sassanid prince; cf. Grousset, 179-180. — For the position of the King of Georgia as *primus inter pares* vis-à-vis the Georgian princes, see Gvritišvili, *P’edol. Sak’arf.* 310-461, résumé on p. 461.

<sup>212</sup> It has already been noted, at n. 175, that the ancient Armenian historians tended to be historians of individual princely houses. In this connexion, too, different families indulged in what Saint-Simon calls, referring to their French equivalents, *chimères* — claims to splendid, exotic, and fanciful origins: from the Kings of Assyria, the Emperors of China, etc.; cf. Laurent, *Arménie* 69. It is perhaps in the nature of a predominantly dynasticist society, when it is gradually deprived of the fulness of its ‘polygenetic’ sovereignty, to be haunted by a sense of downfall; quite in contrast to the sense of ascent, enjoyed by a purely feudal society as its members acquire a greater share in ‘monogenetic’ sovereignty. *Ubi lapsus, quid fecit?*, the motto of a rare Western family affected by this ‘dynasticist pessimism,’ would well express the *Weltanschauung* of many a Caucasian one.

<sup>213</sup> Adontz, *Armenija* 272-277; Toumanoff, *Lists*.

<sup>214</sup> On his death-bed, the High Constable Manuel, Prince of the Mamikonids (*supra* n. 211), extols dying for ‘the Arsacid natural lords of the land’ (*bnak tēranc’ ašzarhi Aršakunoy; Aršakuneac’ bnik tēranc’ ašzarhis*), and exhorts his son never to fear it; Faustus 5.44 (259-260). Cf. also Faustus 5.20.

<sup>215</sup> Cf. Kherumian, *Féodalité* 35-39.

<sup>216</sup> Faustus, 5.2, tells of the Mamikonid High Constable Mušel (elder brother and prede-

was the important and honored position enjoyed by women in Armenian history.<sup>217</sup> Above all, alongside much impiety, superstition, apostasy, immorality, and cruelty, there was a genuine acceptance of Christianity and a readiness to die for it when face to face with Mazdaist and Muslim persecution. Few peer-ages in Christendom can boast as many martyrs.<sup>218</sup>

It may be added that the Arsacid period was one of great prosperity, being in this a direct continuation of the era of the Artaxiads. The life of the nobility was thus marked by a great display of luxury. Of this material well-being, the architectural monuments, practically the sole survivals of a vanished epoch, bear — whether they be ecclesiastical or secular — an eloquent witness.<sup>219</sup>

17. In comparison with the foregoing, the details of the social structure of Iberia in the Parthian and early-Christian phases are far less well known to us. The genesis of that structure and the beginnings of the feudal-dynastic symbiosis in Iberia are, on the other hand, better attested to than in Armenia, as we have had occasion to see. The Iberian Crown appears to have been stronger than the Armenian in relation to the dynastic aristocracy, and the feudal office of duke, with the delegation of 'monogenetic' sovereignty it implied, was not, as a consequence, extended to all the princes, only a few more powerful ones becoming dukes of the provinces of Iberia. A further manifestation of this can be detected in the fact that the Iberian historians were all royal historiographers, not those of different princely houses as in Armenia, and that, partly in connexion with this, very few members of the nobility are mentioned on

---

cessor of Manuel; cf. *supra* n. 214) capturing, in one of the Iranian wars, the entire enemy camp : he ordered the Iranian ladies fallen into Armenian hands to be treated with respect and then sent them back to the Great King, to the latter's utter amazement. Lazarus, 38, tells in his narrative of the Iranian war of 451 how the Armenian army coming upon the enemy and finding them obviously unprepared, spared them a surprise attack, which would have spelt their utter defeat, and offered instead a one-day truce: — *Messieurs les Anglais, tirez les premiers!* — But there was also much cruelty, quite in the style of the Byzantine and Iranian neighbours, of which it is not pleasant to recall details; cf. *infra* n. 218.

<sup>217</sup> Cf. Kherumian, *Féodalité* 55-56. For the similar development in medieval Georgian society, see Marr, *Ku't ženščiny i rycarstvo v počmje Šoty iz Rustava (Teksty i Razykaniya po armjano-gruzinskoj filologii* 12 [St Petersburg 1910]. — In this context must be placed the passing of allods and fiefs through women, in default of heirs male; *supra* n. 158.

<sup>218</sup> The pages of Lazarus and Eliseus bear eloquent witness to this; cf. also Kherumian, *Féodalité* 39-40. The death-bed discourse of the Mamikonid Manuel (*supra* n. 214) can be cited once again, where he praises laying down one's life for one's God-worshipping land, and thus for God, for His Church and her ministers, and for the Arsacid natural lords of the land. Before his death, Manuel personally distributed treasures to the poor and left great donatives to the Church; Faustus 5.44. — For the dark side of Armenian society, see Laurent, *Arménie* 56-57, 59-60; Kherumian, *op. cit.* 41-42.

<sup>219</sup> Cf. Kherumian, *op. cit.* 52-55; Manandyan, *O torgovle* 95-169; Laurent, *Arménie* 34-50.

their pages.<sup>220</sup> Still, the higher nobility, here exactly as in Armenia, was not composed of two allogeneous groups, but rather had two aspects, dynasticist and feudal; the kings, unable to supplant the dynasts, strove at least to keep them divided functionally, and thus under their control. In this endeavor, however, the Iberian Crown was doomed to failure; and the question of succession to the dukedoms was the point on which it and 'the most important pillars of early Georgian monarchy'<sup>221</sup> fell out. Quite feudally, the Crown seems to have from the beginning insisted on regarding the ducal fiefs as non-inheritable, exactly as the office of High Constable was non-inheritable, whilst, quite dynastically, the members of the princely class, who provided the personnel of the feudal order, tended to treat them as hereditary appanages. Apparently as a *pis aller*, the Crown endeavored at least to control ducal succession, as was also the case in Armenia, but even this was resented and resisted. Finally, its aims utterly frustrated, the Iberian Crown was to face the opposition of a united feudal-dynastic aristocracy.<sup>222</sup> The early history of Iberia already bears witness to the decisive role of the dukes in the affairs of the monarchy.<sup>223</sup>

The Iberian historical tradition shows the kingdom divided, as from the Pharnabazid days, into seven duchies, each a province containing a number of cantons. These duchies were: the nucleal one of Inner Iberia or Shida-K'art'li, the fief of the High Constable; and, half circling it in the east, south, and west, Kakhetia or Kakhet'i and Khunani, on the frontier of Albania; then, bordering on Armenia, Samshvilde, Tsunda, and Cholarzene or Klarjet'i; and finally, on the Colchian frontier and north of Tsunda and Cholarzene, Odzrkhe. To these, that tradition adds two more: Marguet'i and Egrisi (Mingrelia); but this is obviously incorrect. These two provinces were parts of Colchis (or Egrisi in the broad sense) and were in no way dependent on the East Georgian

<sup>220</sup> *Supra* at nn. 104-112, also at nn. 136, 140, 168, and nn. 180, 195. Still another instance of the difference was the apparent non-inheritable character of the High Constablenesship in Iberia and its enfeoffment in the Mamikonid dynasty in Armenia.

<sup>221</sup> Allen, *History* 238.

<sup>222</sup> Toumanoff, *Iberia* 23-30. The historian Vaxušt has claimed that originally not only the *erist'avn*, but also the *mt'avarn* were not hereditary and subject to royal appointment, though those dignities might pass to their sons; *Geogr. Descr.* 29. This cannot be true in the case of the latter, and is obviously a manifestation of the author's *étatiste* bias. In the case of the former, however, this appears to be true. Yet it is impossible to tell from what evidence we possess whether the ducal succession was actually non-inheritable or was merely subject to royal control, as in Armenia. We do know that, in the sixth century, the Iberian dukes obtained from the Great King and the Emperor the confirmation of their duchies 'as hereditary patrimonies' and the assurance of being left 'undisturbed in their duchies'; Juanšer 217; cf. Toumanoff, *op. cit.* 40-49. This can be interpreted either as making inheritable what had been non-inheritable before (so Allen, *History* 239) or as merely the freedom from royal sanction.

<sup>223</sup> Cf. Leont. Mrov. 28, 29, 31, 33, 55, 57, 62, 63.

rulers.<sup>224</sup> The dynasties that may have stood at the head of these duchies are almost wholly unknown, as are the princely houses of the cantons comprised in the duchies.<sup>225</sup> The great exception to this is presented by Gogarene, a territory originally Georgian that twice entered and twice left the orbit of Great Armenia. The two successive dynasties of the Vitaxae of Gogarene are indeed well known, and so are the names of some of their vassal princes. The entire 'Vitaxate' of Gogarene, or the Iberian March, corresponded to three Iberian duchies, Samshvilde, Tsunda, and Cholarzene; whereas the Vitaxae's own princely State contained at different periods different portions of Samshvilde and of the rest of southern, or Lower, Iberia.<sup>226</sup>

The Vitaxae of Gogarene were the most important among the vassals of the Kings of Iberia. Gogarene entered the Iberian political sphere for the first time in the first century, during the weakening of Great Armenia that followed the disappearance of the Artaxiads, and then, with its stabilization under the Arsacids, reverted to its original suzerains. When the Arsacids, in their turn, were nearing downfall, in the fourth century, Gogarene again passed to Iberia. It was at that time that a new dynasty, the Mihranids, relatives of the new Iberian royal house, came to the dignity of Vitaxa. The earlier dynasty, if indeed it was one family, was until recently known only from Armenian historical monuments. But the discovery in 1940 of the necropolis near Armazi, ancient capital and pagan holy city of Iberia, which the Vitaxae had built during their first Iberian period, brought to light much new material — Aramaic ('Armazic'), Greek, and Pehlevi inscriptions and objects of cult and of luxury — for the pre-Mihranid rulers of Gogarene. The riches of the

<sup>224</sup> Leont. Mrov. 24-25; cf. *supra* at nn. 104-108. Leontius' text is given below, Supplementary Note F.

<sup>225</sup> It is very likely that the dukes, like the High Constable, were at first non-hereditary. Some even appear as not of the princely class; but these must have been exceptions, for, indeed, they are specifically noted, as in Leont. Mrov. 47, 48, where the Dukes of Ojrxē and of Cholarzene are said to have been 'of the gentry' (*aznaurt'agani*); cf. *supra* n. 112. On the other hand, the Bagratids appear to have branched off to Iberia sometime in the first century and to have held (intermittently perhaps) the Duchy of Ojrxē; my *Orontids* II. Of the princes, the Georgian monuments reveal only one in that early period: him of Kola (the Kol of the Armenians, in Tao-Tayk'; Hübschmann, *Ortsnamen* 357, 359; Javaxišvili, *K'art' er. ist.* II. 324-325); cf. *supra* n. 94. For the other princes, see the following note.

<sup>226</sup> For the Vitaxae of Gogarene, see my *Vitaxae* V. — The remaining Georgian princes of the time are known to us only from Armenian sources. They are all from the Armenian frontier and vassals of the Vitaxae of Gogarene, viz., those of Jor[op'or] and Kolb[op'or] (Faustus 4.50; Ps. Moses 2.8); of Ašoc' and Tašir (Lazarus 23, 42, 47; Ps. Moses 2.8); all of them, according to Ps. Moses, were Haykids, i.e., local dynasts. Armenian Ašoc' = Georgian Aboc'i, Tašir = Taširi; with the exception of the former, all the other cantons were, according to the Armenian geographers, in Gogarene; Hübschmann, *Ortsnamen* 353-354; my *Vitaxae* § 17-18, n. 145; *Lists*.

find testify eloquently to the great position of these rulers. Their titles remained in the Iberian Monarchy the same as they had been in the Armenian. They are referred to by the Armazi inscriptions simply by the title of vitaxa; other monuments call them 'Vitaxae of Iberia,' exactly as they had been entitled in the Armenian kingdom, or — what had been the Iberian March of Armenia having become Iberia's Armenian March — 'Vitaxae of Armenia.'<sup>227</sup>

By the fifth century, the term *aznaur*, in addition to designating the lesser noblesse *par excellence*, had come to denote likewise the whole body of the nobility, princes and knights together, exactly as was the case in Great Armenia.<sup>228</sup>

The references of the Armenian historians to the nobility of Iberia, and also of Albania, and those of the Iberian historians to the Armenian nobility demonstrate the sameness, indeed the unity, of the aristocracies of the three countries. The same social terms — *tanutēr*, *sepuh*, *naxarar*, etc. — are applied by the Armenian historians to members of the Iberian and Albanian, no less than to those of the Armenian, nobility. Conversely, the Iberian historians apply the Georgian terms: *m'avar*, *erist'av*, *sep'ecul* to Armenian princes. Occasionally, Armenian monuments speak of the 'naxarark' of Armenia, Iberia, and Albania,' as of one body.<sup>229</sup>

These, then, were the background and the structure of Caucasian society as it entered its formative centuries. If the social structure has been given much attention here, it is because it was the most perdurable and, possibly, the most decisive factor in Caucasian history. If the uppermost stratum of that structure has been dwelt upon at some length, it is because, in the circumstances, the dynastic aristocracy of Caucasia — and not the Crown, not even the Church, nor the gentry, nor the burgesses, nor the peasants — were the natural and unquestioned leaders of the community, the creative minority that set for it the pattern of behavior, the style of life.<sup>230</sup> As will be seen in

<sup>227</sup> Toumanoff, *Vitaxae* § 16.

<sup>228</sup> The *Mart. St. Susan* 17 (43) shows the population of Iberia divided into the nobles and the non-nobles (*supra* n. 101): this can only mean that the dynasts were included among the former. In the same breath, however, a distinction is made between *aznaurni* and *aznaurni did-didni*. The latter term is the exact equivalent of the Armenian *mecamec* (*supra* n. 133); thus, the 'great nobles' signified the dynasts. Later in the Middle Ages, this ambivalent use of *aznaur* was quite usual.

<sup>229</sup> Thus, Faustus 5.15 (215); 'all the nobles and houses of *naxarark'*' (*zamenayn azats ew zazgs naxararac'n*) in Iberia; — *ibid.*: *naxarark'* in Gogarene; — Lazarus 25 (96): *tanutēr* and *sepuh* of Armenia, Iberia, and Albania; — 25 (98): Ašuša [of Gogarene] and other *tanutēr* of Iberia; — 26 (98): all these are called *mecamecn* ('grandees'); — 27 (103, 106): *naxarark'* of the three nations. Leont. Mrov. 61: *m'avar* of Armenia; — Juanšer 159: *erist'av* of Armenia; — Juanšer 156: *sep'ecul* Bagratid.

<sup>230</sup> Cf. Adontz, *Armenija* xiv, 211-214. — This social structure perished with the brutal Byzantine and Seljuq destruction of the Armenian polity in the eleventh century. Some



a later study, the acceptance of Christianity by that community served to enhance this situation.

## SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES

### Note A (cf. n. 30 *supra*)

#### THE 'THIRD' STRATUM OF MEDITERRANEAN CIVILIZATION

To designate this linguistic, and also ethnic, stratum several terms have been used: — 'Caucasian,' the most popular, due chiefly to H. Winkler (*Die Sprache der zweiten Columne der dreisprachigen Inschriften und das Altäische* [Breslau 1896]; cf. A. Trombetti, *Elementi di glottologia* [Bologna 1922]); 'Casite': A. Wirth ('Kasische Forschungen,' *Memnon* 3 [1909-1910] 1-48; *Der Gang der Weltgeschichte* [Gotha 1913]); 'Alarodian': F. Homel (*Ethnologie und Geographie des alten Orients* [Munich 1926]); 'Asianic' (= 'Anatolian,' 'of Asia Minor'): G. Conteneau (*L'Asie occidentale ancienne* [Paris 1936]); 'Caspian': B. Hrozný (*Hist. Asie ant.* 1947) and E. Herzfeld (*Archaeological History of Iran* [London 1935]); 'Japhet[h]ite': N. Marr and his school of Japhetology (*Osnovnyja tablitsy k grammatike drevne-gruzinskago jazyka* [St. Petersburg 1908]; *Jafetičeskij Kavkaz i tretij element v sozdanii sredizemnomorskoj kul'tury* [Leipzig 1920] = *Der japhetitische Kaukasus und das dritte ethnische Element im Bildungsprozess der mittelländischen Kultur* [tr. F. Braun: Berlin 1923]); 'Escualdo-Alarodian': J. Karst (*Alarodiens et proto-Basques* [Vienne 1928]). Marr and Karst have elaborated systems of great comprehensiveness and complexity that can be described as maximalist interpretations of the available data; for this, see also Marr, *Izbr. raboty*; 'Jafetidy,' *Vostok* 1 (1922); 'Jafetičeskie jazyki,' *Bol'saja Sovetskaja Ėnciklopedija* 45 (1931); 'Novyj povorot v rabote po Jafetičeskoj teorii,' *Izvestija Akademii Nauk S.S.S.R.* 1931. 637-682; I. Meščaninov, 'Os-

---

vestiges of it, however, survived the catastrophe, both in Armenia and, through emigration, elsewhere. In north-eastern Armenia these vestiges continued to the Mongol invasions, according to Adontz, or even to the fifteenth century, according to Manandyan, *P'eodal. Hay.* 138, 251-260, 304-305. There were a number of great Byzantine houses (like the Tornicii and the Taronitae) that were the result of the removal to the imperial territory of Armenian princely houses; and, especially, a considerable admixture to Georgia's parallel feudal-dynastic society (including the royal family itself) was provided by the princely *émigrés* from Armenia. Georgian society, as here described, survived down to the Russian annexations of the nineteenth century; cf. my *Nobl. géorg.* Georgian feudalism was to develop in the Middle Ages (and so beyond the scope of this study) into a phenomenon of great complexity, quite comparable to what can be observed in the medieval West or in Arsacid Armenia. 'A l'Age d'Or le féodalisme géorgien atteignit donc sa floraison complète. Il montrait toute la complexité qu'on observe en Europe Occidentale: fiefs et arrière-fiefs, *dominium directum* et *dominium utile*; alleux, fiefs-seigneuries, fiefs véritables; vasselage, investiture, hommage; service féodal et immunité; ... et, dans l'ordre moral, les mœurs chevaleresques et la 'courtoisie'; *ibid.* 266; cf. 264-268; Allen, *History* 250-256; Javaxišvili, *K'art'li samart'li*. *ist.* 63-107.

novnye načala Jafetidologii,' *Izvestija Obščestva Obsledovanija i Izučeniya Azerbejdžana* 1 (1925); P. Ušakov, 'Xettskaja problema,' *Travaux de l'Université Staline à Tbilissi* 1941. 87-112; Allen, *History* 22 ff.; A. Gugushvili, 'Nicholas Marr and his Japhetic Theory,' *Georgica* 1.1 (1935) 101-115; L. Thomas, *The Linguistic Theories of N. Ja. Marr* (Un. of California Publications in Linguistics 14, 1957); Baschmakoff, *Cinquante siècles d'évolution ethnique autour de la mer Noire* (Paris 1937) 73-97; Karst, *Les Ligures* (Strasbourg 1930); *Origines méditerranéennes* (Heidelberg 1931). — For a cautious, minimalist, interpretation, see, e.g., Speiser, *Origins* 1-25, 164-178; Hrozný, *Hist. Asie ant.* 77-83.

There seems to be in evidence among some specialists today a tendency, almost disarmingly naive in its eagerness, to discover Indo-European (or 'Indo-Germanic,' or 'Aryan') 'aristocracies,' 'conquerors,' or 'dominations' in the ancient Eastern Mediterranean, often enough on the basis of flimsy linguistic data and in the teeth of much else. Thus, in spite of the Bible's coupling of the Muški with the unquestionably local Tabal (*supra* nn. 24, 25), the former are often regarded as identical with the Indo-European Phrygians who supplanted them in Anatolia and took over their ethnicon (cf. Manandyan, *O nek. sporn. probl.* 143; Adontz, *Hist. d'Arm.* 277-278). Fortunately, the equating of 'Hurri' and 'Aryan,' the supposed 'blondness' of the Guti, and the Indo-European composition of the Urartian ruling class (for the latter hypothesis, cf., e.g., Lehmann-Haupt, *Origin* 69-74) have been abandoned; cf. Speiser, *Origins* 131 n. 37, 100-108; Adontz, *Hist. d'Arm.* 270-282 (where the question of Indo-Europeans in Urartu is simply not even raised).

There still remains, however, the Hittite problem. The apparent Indo-European affinities of some of the languages used in the Hittite empire (for which see Goetze, *Kleinasien* 45-61), and especially of the 'official language' ('Hittite,' 'KanesHITE,' 'Neshite,' are some of the names used to designate it), led many to assume that empire itself to have been the result of an Indo-European invasion of Anatolia, sometime in the third or the second millennium B.C., and to speak, accordingly, of an 'Indo-European warrior nobility' in it (e.g., Brundage, *Feud. in Mesop. and Iran* 100) which was 'more intelligent and vigorous than the natives [i.e., the local Anatolian proto-Hattians of Hurrian affinities]' (C. Ceram, *The Secret of the Hittites* [New York 1956] 123). However, for such an invasion of Asia Minor there is no other evidence; the pictorial records (cf. Cavaignac, *Monde méd.* 106) and the proto-Hattian or Hurrian names of kings and gods (cf. Ceram 93) offer no support to this theory; the archaeological and anthropological data are sufficiently incomplete (cf. Goetze 8-44; Hrozný 172-177) to admit of marshalling in favor of this or, for that matter, any other theory; and the proponents of this theory cannot even agree among themselves as to whence this supposed invasion may have come.

So we are left with only the linguistic considerations as the basis for the theory in question. Now it must be rather obvious that philological data alone cannot always be taken as absolute indications of sociological facts. Thus, an official language is not necessarily the language of a conqueror, as witness the case of the Bulgars in the Balkans, the Ostrogoths in Italy, the Franks in Gaul; or the proto-Armenians, among whom the dominant proto-Caucasian Hayasa employed the Indo-European tongue of the Thraco-Phrygians who had mingled with them (*supra* n.22). But even had there been an Indo-European invasion of Anatolia, it would still be unrealistic, not to say romantic, to presume the existence of a

homogeneous Indo-European ruling class among the Hittites; one need only to think of the Gallo-Roman and Anglo-Saxon contributions to the nobiliary bodies of medieval France and medieval England, respectively. What is more important, the presence of linguistic affinities need not at all imply conquest and domination, but may be explained by infiltration and admixture. It can only have been a desire (often enough unconscious) to see Indo-Europeans as a perennial *Herrenrasse* that has so often conditioned the choice of the former as the sole possible explanation. But — and this is more important still — even the philological basis of all these elaborations of Hittite history has not been universally accepted by specialists. Accordingly, parallel to the Indo-European theory of the Hittite language, which was first enunciated by Hrozný, there is another theory, which was arrived at upon the examination of the same linguistic data by E. Forrer (in *Mitteil. d. Deutsch. Orientgesellschaft* 61 [1921] 26 ff.) and E. H. Sturtevant (e.g. *The Indo-Hittite Laryngeal* [Philadelphia 1942] 23-29). According to it, 'Indo-European-Hittite' is 'not a descendant but a sister language of proto-Indo-European'; cf. Speiser, *Origins* 18 n. 37. In the second edition of *Kleinasien* (1957), Goetze (58-60) sums up the arguments for the two theories, but refrains from committing himself to either. This uncertainty further weakens the case for an Indo-European invasion, let alone 'supremacy,' in early Anatolia.

The Japhetological school, of course, goes further still. It is not necessary to subscribe to the Marxian linguistics of Marr's final phase — which would ascribe the differences between various linguistic groups no longer to different ethnic backgrounds, but solely to their being incident to different stages of the material development of human society in general — in order to admit as at least possible the theory elaborated by some of that school, which would see in the neo-Hittite linguistic phenomenon a perfectly natural growth, a further development of the proto-Hattian phenomenon, organically connected with other Japhetite groups and one subsequently, *via* the Aegean world, influencing the much younger *real* Indo-European groups; cf. Ušakov, *Xet'sk. probl.*; 'Problemy drevnjšego naselenija Maloj Azii, Kavkaza i Ėgeidy,' *Vestnik Drevnej Istorii* 1939/4; 'Drevnejšie narody Gruzii i novye arxeologičeskie otkrytija,' *Sak'art'velos Sax. Muzeumis Moambe* 10 (1940); 'K poxodam Urartijecv v Zakavkaz'e v IX i VIII vv. do n.č.,' *Vestnik Drevnej Istorii* 1946/2. Goetze's impartiality with regard to the two linguistic theories mentioned above did not preclude him from holding the belief in the Indo-European invasion. Commenting on the Hittite king's feudal position of a *primus inter pares* in relation to the nobility, he writes (88), echoing Hrozný, 'diese Auffassung des Königtums ist ganz unorientalisch; nichts von Absolutismus und Gottesgnadentum. Sie beruht wohl auf Anschauungen, die die indogermanische Herrenschaft unter den Hethitern aus Europa mitgebracht hat.' One may well ask about the evidence for the existence of such *Anschauungen* in the Europe of the third-second millennium B.C., and conclude, if the above sentence be taken seriously, that Chou China, for instance, was *ganz unorientalisch*, whereas a Louis XIV or a James I and VI must decidedly be regarded as 'Oriental' (whatever that may mean)!

What is not altogether devoid of piquancy is that, in their zeal, the proponents of the Indo-European racial supremacy do not hesitate to employ diametrically opposite, nay, mutually exclusive, arguments. Thus, in the case of the Hittites, the argument is from the 'Indo-Europeanisms' of the official language, while the non-Indo-European religious and royal onomastics are overlooked. On the

other hand, the existence of a 'caste de dominateurs d'origine indo-européenne' (Hrozný 164) in Mitanni is argued from the — indeed — Indic names of some deities and from some terms connected with horse breeding, while the wholly non-Indo-European official Hurrian language is overlooked; cf. Goetze 62-63; Hrozný 164-166. The terms in question are known from Hittite texts and in connexion with the borrowing of specialists in this field from Mitanni; the latter may well be supposed to have borrowed its knowledge of horse breeding, the relevant terms, and even the gods from some neighboring Indic peoples. At all events, no more than admixture and influence can justifiably be inferred from this scanty evidence. — So far as the somatic indicia are concerned, the inhabitants of Caucasia can, for all their variety, be broadly classed with the Armenoid-Alpine subdivision of the White Race (the latter called 'Caucasian' since the days of J. F. Blumenbach, as being the 'purest' in Caucasia); cf., e.g., A. Javakhishvili, 'The Caucasian Race,' *Georgica* 1.2-3 (1936) 92-108; Speiser, *Origins* 9-10, 173.

Note B (cf. n. 111 *supra*)

THE 'GREAT KING' OF IBERIA: A THEOPHANIC MONARCH

The earliest Iberian literary monuments, written in Aramaic (the 'Armazic' variety), Pehlevi, and Greek, have recently come to light with the discovery in 1940 of the necropolis of the Vitaxae of Gogarene, near Armazi; G. Ceret'eli, *Ėpigrafičeskie naxodki v Mxeta, drevnej stolice Gruzii*, *Vestnik Drevnej Istorii* 1948/2.50, 52; and *Armazsakaja bilingva* (Tiflis 1941); H. Nyberg, 'Quelques inscriptions antiques découvertes récemment en Géorgie,' *Eranos* 44 (1946) 228-243; Tarchnišvili, 'Les récentes découvertes épigraphiques et littéraires en géorgien,' *Le Muséon* 63 (1950) 251; Amiranašvili, *Ist. gruz. isk.* 84-86. One of these inscriptions, in Armazic, begins as follows: 'King Michridates, Great King, son of Pharasmanes, Great King. I, Šaragas, son of the Lord Zeuaches. I, Šaragas, Vitaxa of King Michridates...' then ensues a narrative of Šaragas' victories, including some wrought in Armenia (Ceret'eli 52). Now, Mithridates, son of Pharasmanes, is the King of Iberia mentioned in Vespasian's inscription of A.D. 75, found near Mc'xet'a and now preserved in the Georgian Museum; Dittenberger, *Or. gr. inscr.* I.586-588; Amiranašvili, 'Grečeskie nadpisi Museja Gruzii,' *Sak'art'velos Muzeumis Moambe* 4 (1928) 191-196. Both 'Mithridates' and 'Michridates' render the Georgian 'Mihrdat.' Pharasmanes I of Iberia had a brother also named Mithridates, and another son Rhadamistus, both of whom claimed, and momentarily occupied, the throne of Armenia, in the years 35-54; Tacitus, *Ann.* 6.32-36; 11.8-9; Dio Cassius 58.26; cf. Asdourian, *Arm. u. Rom* 81-84; Debevoise, *Parthia* 158-160, 169-170, 174-178, 182, 185, 243-244. It is obvious that the Armazic inscription in question refers to the above events of the first century (and it is difficult to see why Amiranašvili, for instance, should have attempted to identify King Pharasmanes mentioned in this and other inscriptions of the find with Pharasmanes II of Iberia, ally of Hadrian and Antoninus Pius; *Ist. gruz. isk.* 85). Whether Michridates, son of Pharasmanes, took part in the Armenian venture of Mithridates the brother and of Rhadamistus, or whether it was only the Vitaxa Šaragas who waged war there on behalf of these two Iberian princes under Pharasmanes I, it is impossible to tell until the full text of the inscription has been published.

The religious character of the title 'Great King' and its equivalence with 'King of Kings' have already been commented upon, *supra* nn. 18, 53. It tallies well with a few facts preserved in the Iberian historical tradition regarding the theophanic (*supra* n.7) character of the early Kings of Iberia. Thus, the first King, Pharnabazus, is said to have set up in the sacred citadel of Iberia, where his divine ancestor and eponym of the people, K'art'los, was supposed to lie buried, the statue of the chief god Armaz and to have made of that citadel, thereafter named no longer K'art'li, but Armaz[n]i, the centre of that god's cult; Leont. Mrov. 25; cf. *supra* n. 81. His third successor, P'arnajom is reported to have raised another idol, that of the god Zaden, and to have built another citadel to house it; Leont. Mrov. 29; *Roy. List I* 49. In a penetrating study (*Elements* 31-45) Professor Tseretheli has shown, to my mind conclusively, that Armaz was, in spite of his Iranian name acquired through his subsequent identification with Ahura-Mazdāh, the Georgian version of the Anatolian-Mesopotamian fecundator-god and also sky-storm-lightning-god, best known under his Hittite name of Tešub/Tešup; for him, see also G. Furlani, *La religione degli Hittiti* (Bologna 1936) 35-36; M. Eliade, *Patterns in Comparative Religion* (New York 1958) 86-91. As an addition to Tseretheli's argument, I may add that, in the passage just referred to, Leont. Mrov. explains that the name of King Pharnabazus was the Persian equivalent of the name of the chief god. Now, the King's name was derived from the Avest. *x<sup>o</sup>arēnahvant* or 'brilliant,' 'splendid' (Tseretheli 38; Justi, *Namenbuch* 92; cf. Hübschmann, *Grammatik* 89); and 'illustrious' (i.e., precisely 'brilliant and splendid') was the epithet attributed to the Hittite version of Tešub; Engnell, *Divine Kingship* 54.

The presence of the cult of Tešub among the proto-Georgians seems indicated also by various archaeological data; Amiranašvili, *Ist. gruz. isk.* 50, 53. The Step'ancminda find (for which, see *ibid.* 53-59; A. Tallgren, 'Caucasian Monuments: the Kazbek Treasure,' *Eurasia Septentrionalis Antiqua* 5 [1930] 109-182) yielded figurines definitively associated with a fertility cult, standing on bull's horns and holding hammers; and indeed Tešub was occasionally represented as holding a hammer, an axe, or a mace, and his role of fecundator entailed a connexion with bulls; cf. Furlani 36; Amiranašvili 50; Furlani gives a different explanation for Tešub's connexion with bulls, but cf. Eliade 76, 79, 83, 85-93, 110. Moreover, as Tlebš, god of iron and of arms, Tešub appears to have survived among the Circassians; B. Stael, 'Ėtnograficeskij očerk čerkessakago naroda,' *Kavkazskij Sbornik* 21 (1952) 112. Some scholars have attempted to identify Armaz with a moon-god (I. Boltunov, 'K voprosu ob Armazi,' *Vestnik Drevnej Istorii* 1949/2.237; Tarchnišvili, in *Bedi Karthlisa* 10 [Paris 1951] 19-22), and indeed *arma* appears to have been the Luvian word for 'moon' and the moon-god (Goetze, *Kleinasien* 50, 134; Furlani 39-40), but whatever lunar features Armaz may well have had need not exclude his basic identity with Tešub; as Eliade has indicated, storm, rain, and fertility (Tešub's domain) easily became associated with lunar religion, while the bull's horns served also to symbolize the moon; Eliade 87, 159-161, 163-167, cf. 182-185. Tseretheli has also shown (*Elements* 45-50) Zaden to have been none other than Sandon or Šandaš/Šantaš, the Anatolian god of vegetation and also of fertility. The sequence of the razing of the Iberian idols by the early kings, first of Armaz and then of Zaden, may dovetail with the hierarchy of their prototypes among the Hittites, the storm-god being the father of the vegetation-god; Goetze, *Kleinasien* 143.



What is of significance here is the fact that the Hittite, the Mesopotamian, and other East Mediterranean theophanic kings were closely associated with the cult of the sky and vegetation deities; cf. Engnell 16-70; Fraine, *Royauté isr.* 370. 'The civilization of the ancient Near East... symbolized politically organized society as a cosmic analogue, a cosmion, by letting vegetative rhythms and celestial revolutions function as models for the structural and procedural order of society'; Voegelin, *Order and History* I 5-6. It would require special reasons for supposing that the Kings of ancient Iberia were not theophanic monarchs on the pattern of their earlier Mesopotamian and Anatolian, and their contemporary Hellenistic *confrères*. Such reasons do not exist. For a reference to the ceremonial adoration (*t'aquanis-c'ema* = *προσκύνησις*) paid to the Iberian monarchs, and also to their coronation, see Leont. Mrov. 35. For the cult of the Armenian kings, see *supra* n. 120.

Note C (cf. n. 159 *supra*)

THE PRINCIPLES OF CAUCASIAN SUCCESSION

Among the sources of Caucasian genealogy to the end of the early-medieval period are found: (1) epigraphical data, such as the Nimrud-dağ inscriptions of Antiochus I of Commagene, for the Orontids (Toumanoff, *Orontids* I.2), or the Mc'xet'a inscription of Vespasian, for the Kings of Iberia (*supra* n. 111); — (2) Greek and Roman historians, for the Orontids and Artaxiads of Armenia, and for the Kings of Iberia; — (3) contemporary or near-contemporary Armenian historians, for the Arsacids and various princely dynasties (cf. Adontz's summary of some facts of succession in *Armenija* 464 n.1); — (4) the Armenian historical tradition (*Prim. Hist. Arm.*; Ps. Moses), for the antecedent epochs; — (5) the Iberian historical tradition (Leont. Mrov.; *Roy. List I, II*), for the antecedent epochs; — (6) the Iberian historian Juanšer (786/800), for the period from the fifth to the eighth century.

All this evidence is in part fragmentary and almost always schematic. Yet definite conclusions can be reached on the basis of it. There is, in the case of Armenia, the statement of Ps. Moses, 2.8 (cf. 2.1), for instance, to the effect that the rule (*ōrenk'*) of the Arsacids (i.e., the Artaxiads and the Arsacids; cf. *supra* at n. 126) was for the throne to pass from father to eldest son (lit. 'first son' = *zaraĵinn ordin*) and then to the latter's son, while younger sons were given appanages. Since Ps. Moses was writing at the time when (as can be seen in § 12) that kind of succession tended to be gradually set aside, his witness to it appears especially worthy of credence. What we know of Artaxiad and Arsacid genealogy, moreover, fully bears this out. From Juanšer we learn that King Vaxtang Gorgasal of Iberia was succeeded by his eldest son, in 522/3, his other sons having no part in the succession and receiving appanages. The case of the family of St. Mirian of Iberia (in the fourth century), as presented in Leont. Mrov., is complicated by the fact that it is nowhere explicitly stated that Rev, whom he co-opted, was the elder of his two sons. There seems, however, to be no doubt that he was; but, since he predeceased his father, his line lost the succession, which passed to his brother and his brother's posterity. This was a case reminiscent of the loss of the succession by the family of Ferdinand de la Cerda, Alfonso X of Castile's eldest son, who died before his father, in favor of Alfonso's second son Sancho IV and his line.



On the whole, then, our sources amply demonstrate the prevalence in the Hellenistic and early-medieval periods not only of a patrilineal succession, but moreover of one devolving upon the eldest son. There is not, on the other hand, any indication that this patrilineal system was, as it has been in Muslim society, connected with the choice of the reigning sovereign rather than with the age of his sons. The system of patrilineal seniority can only be called 'primogeniture.' The fact that the term has been associated with a fixed law, as it has comparatively recently been formed in Western Europe, need not inhibit us from applying it to this ancient customary norm: suffice it to remember the biblical insistence on *bēkhôr πρωτότοκος primogenitus*, *bēkhôrāh πρωτοτόκια primogenita (primitiva)*, etc. This customary norm of primogeniture applied in Caucasia to the transmission of political power. For the administration of private property corporately owned by a family, the probably more ancient, tribal system of fraternal or joint-family succession was, on the other hand, often resorted to (cf. *supra*, note 160). The latter system must, nevertheless, have ceded to the former when a family was vested with sovereignty in addition to owning property.

In spite of the opinions of modern historians, the more civilized system of patrilineal seniority must have made its appearance in Caucasia rather early. The succession to the throne in pre-Achaemenian Anatolia and Mesopotamia was distinctly patrilineal; see, for the former, Goetze, *Kleinasien* 87, 94. This is connected with the prominent part played in the royal cult by the ceremony of the installation of the king's son as crown prince; Engnell, *Divine Kingship* 17, 58-59; Goetze 95; Fraine, *Royauté isr.* 185-186. Furthermore, the special role assigned by the dynastic religion of the Hittites to the queen (Engnell 70) would indicate that in Anatolia at any rate, as a result of the dynastic constitution of King Telepinuš, the transmission of the royal power was effected not merely patrilineally, but also according to primogeniture. The Hittite queen — the principal wife of the king — was entitled *tawananna* and had a definite share not only in the royal cult, but also in the domain of politics and administration. It was her son who was the crown prince; and only when she had no sons did the son of the second wife or the *esertu*, and, when the latter had no sons, then that of a wife of the *naplartu* class, become the heir to the throne; Goetze 87, 92-95. It seems clear that, among the queen's sons, the eldest was in normal circumstances the natural heir. Early Armenian and Iberian history makes ample reference to queens, i.e., consorts and participants in the public character of kings; and in Iberia, as has been seen (Note B), definite traces of a royal religion of Hittite and Mesopotamian affinities can be observed. The introduction of the system of primogeniture to Caucasia could, therefore, be supposed to have taken place in pre-Achaemenian times.

At all events, the Achaemenid and the Hellenistic monarchs followed precisely that style of succession (cf. e.g., the complete Achaemenid genealogy in Justi, *Namenbuch* 398-399; and, for Hellenistic primogeniture, P. Jouguet, *L'impérialisme macédonien et l'hellénisation de l'Orient* [Paris 1926] 345); so if the Hittite and Mesopotamian influences had been insufficient in this respect, the Achaemenid and Macedonian example would, at a somewhat later epoch, have proved sufficiently impelling. However, from time to time and especially at moments of trouble and of weakening of the political forms, the old tribal ways made themselves felt, in connexion not only with private inheritance, but also with

the transmission of public power. The by-norm of lateral succession (*supra* at n. 159) must have been to a great extent a manifestation of this. At a later period, by the tenth century, the by-norm tended to supersede the norm, as witness Armenian genealogies, until, after the Armenian polity had disintegrated and the monarchy had long ceased to exist, it was proclaimed as the sole norm in the amateurish and artificial legal compilation of Mxit'ar Goš († 1213); *Datastanagirk'* 2.1. A similar development can be seen in Georgia. In the late Middle Ages, the old lateral system came to affect the succession to the throne under the guise of the imported Byzantine system of collegial sovereignty (for which, see Toumanoff, *Fifteenth-Cent. Bagr.*); and, just before the monarchy ended its historical existence on the threshold of the nineteenth century, fraternal succession was officially adopted in lieu of the paternal system; cf. Karst, *Corpus juris* 1:2.2.226-286.

In view of all this, it is permissible, I think, to question the exactness of Strabo's statement regarding the manner of the succession to the throne of Iberia (cf. *supra* at n. 95); possibly he was influenced in this by the system of corporate ownership (on which, see *supra*, notes 160,161), or he may have derived his information from an antiquated source: in this case, however, the introduction of primogeniture in Iberia could not have occurred much earlier than the Hellenistic period. — For succession in medieval Armenia, see Laurent, *Arménie* 62-63, 73. Of succession, other than royal, in medieval Georgia, we know but little. The 'mediatization' of the princes, resulting from the ascendancy of the Crown in the Golden Age and the beginning of the division of princely domains in the fifteenth century (*supra* n. 130), must have deprived them to a great extent of their public character as holders of sovereign power, though their governmental rights remained very extensive. When combined with the influence of the old, autochthonous system, this must account for the fact that in post-medieval Georgia, except in the case of the few still fully sovereign princes, the position of the head of a dynasty, ruler of a princedom (*sat'avado*), and administrator of a dynastic communal property passed according to a system of tanistry, subject to the confirmation by the king; Gvritišvili, *P'eodal. Sak'art'* 258.

#### Note D (cf. n. 167 *supra*)

##### THE 'AZAT' NOBILITY

*Azat*, meaning 'noble' and 'free' (cf. e.g., Luke 19.12; Acts 17.4; I Cor. 1.26; Gal. 3.28), is derived from an Irano-Armenian root indicative of birth, from which are also derived the words *azg* and *azn*, signifying 'race,' 'family,' etc. (*supra* n. 137), and, through the latter, the Georgian sociological equivalent of *azat*: — *aznaur*. Other derivatives of the same root have in the earliest monuments and biblical translations likewise the sense of freedom and birth; Hübschmann, *Grammatik* 91. The Iranian *āzāt* of the Sassanian epoch is the exact etymological and sociological equivalent of this Armenian term; Christensen, *Iran Sass.* 111-113; cf. Adontz, *Armenija* 444; *Aspect* 144; Herzfeld, *Paikuli* 129. The equivalence of this social group with the knights of medieval Western society was immediately recognized whenever the two societies met, as in Cilician Armenia. Accordingly, the High Constable Smbat († 1276), a noted representative of the somewhat Gallicized Armeno-Cilician aristocracy of the time, explains in his Code,

1.70, the meaning of *azat* by the Armenian adaptation to *chevalier*: — *jiawor*. It is curious that in *Armenija*, Adontz should have so completely failed to speak of the *azatk'* as a social group and thus implicitly identified them with the *sepuhk'*. In Adontz, *Aspect*, however, the distinction between them is clear, though only one of the many possible origins of the group is given: the descent from the princes; in this, Grousset follows Adontz. In connexion with this social order, the question of the *ostanikk'* must now be approached. The term, the singular of which is *ostanik*, signified 'men of the *ostan*, i.e., Court' (*supra* at n. 137), in other words, 'courtier.' Occasionally, historians apply to them the adjective *ark'uni* or 'royal.' It is, therefore, gratuitous to assume with Adontz (*Armenija* 477) that the *ostan* from which these men derived their appellation was the royal Court *par excellence*, for in such case the adjective 'royal' would either always be applied to them or, what is more logical, not be used at all. Ps. Moses is responsible for a certain amount of confusion among modern historians regarding this subject. He makes two statements about it. In 1.30, mention is made of the 'nobility called *ostan*.' In 2.7, he is more explicit. Here he speaks of the guard called *ostan*, regiments founded by the first Arsacids (= Artaxiads; cf. *supra* at n. 126) and manned by descendants of the ancient, Haykid, kings, who were thus equivalent to the *sep'eculn* of Iberia and who held lands inherited from their ancestors; later on, however, others were taken into these regiments that were called *ark'uni*. On the basis of this information and of the *obiter dicta* of older historians, Adontz (*Armenija* 123, 476-479) and after him Jānašia (*K kritike* 473-487) came to the belief that the *ostanikk'* were all connected with the royal Court of Armenia and (since in *Armenija* Adontz failed to accept the existence of *azatk'* as anything other than a synonym of the *sepuhk'*) that they were junior branches of the successive royal houses: in short, royal *sepuhk'*. This is difficult to accept. The historians cited by Adontz, i.e., Lazarus 36 (142), 41 (157), 93 (376) and Eliseus 1 (16), 4 (119), show (a) only some of the *ostanikk'* to have been qualified *ark'uni*; (b) the *ostanikk'* to have been counted together with the *azatk'*; (c) princely cadets and even *azatk'* to have been on occasion mentioned ahead of the *ostanikk'*, a thing hardly credible in the case of cadets of the royal house. Furthermore, (d) royal cadets are referred to in the sources precisely as *sepuhk'* (Faustus, 4.15, mentions a king's nephew as *mec sepuh Aršakuni*; cf. *supra* at n. 138); (e) the Haykids, as has been seen, were all princely; (f) and so also the junior branches of the Arsacids; Adontz, *Armenija* 123-125; Jānašia, *K kritike* 487-491. Actually, there is no warrant in the sources for the theory of the older historians that the term in question denoted a social group. It seems to me that it merely designated a socially heterogeneous but professionally unified group, namely — as ought to be patent from its name — the courtiers, and more particularly, it would seem, armed retainers. There could be, accordingly, the *ostanikk'* of the princes and those of the king, qualified in this case as *ark'uni*. Their composition could be most various: *azatk'* mostly, no doubt, but also princely cadets, and, in the case of the king's *entourage*, possibly also royal cadets. The precedence of members of this group, as found in the sources, would quite naturally depend on their social origins. All this must have been at the base of Ps. Moses's narrative; as well as the fact that some of the *azatk'*, and consequently of the *ostanikk'* — and possibly this was particularly true in the case of those who were *ark'uni* — were allodialists; and, moreover, of these some may indeed, by way of an exception, have been *déclassé*

dynasts, and so Haykids (exactly as there have been exceptional non-princely houses of dynastic origin in Russia and Lithuania; cf. *supra* n. 12). As in Western Europe and in Iran, smaller allodialists easily failed to form part of the higher nobility and became instead members of the gentry; Adontz, *Armenija* 458-459; the case of Iran will be discussed in a later study.

*Note E* (cf. n. 188 *supra*)

TAYK', THE MAMIKONIDS, AND THE OFFICE OF HIGH CONSTABLE

For Tayk' (of the Armenians) = Tao (of the Georgians), which was the territorialized people-state of the proto-Caucasian Daiaeni, the *Táoχοι* of the Greeks, see Adontz, *Hist. d'Arménie* 207; Manandyan, *O nek. sporn. probl.* 18-19, 126; Piotrovskij, *Urartu* 27; Gugushvili, *Division* 64-65. It was the *παρώρεια τοῦ Παρβάδρον* which, according to Strabo, 11.14.5, was wrested by the Artaxiads of Armenia from Iberia; Markwart, *Eranšahr* 116; *Südarmerien* 21\*-22\*; Hübschmann, *Ortsnamen* 277; cf. my *Vitaxae* § 16-17. Tayk' is the Mamikonid land in the oldest Armenian historical documents; Gk. Life of St. Gregory 172 (ed. Garitte, *Documents* 103, where Tayk' and Tarawn form together the diocese of the Bishop of the House of the High Constable); Faustus 3.18(58), 4.2 (76), 4.18(137); Lazarus 41(157), 62(242), 75(299). On the other hand, Ps. Moses does not know of it as a Mamikonid principedom, which means that the dynasty must have lost it before his time — an interesting contributive factor to establishing his epoch; Adontz, *Armenija* 310. For Tarawn, the *Ta(u)raunitium* of the Romans, *Táqavva*, *Ταρώ(ν)* of the Greeks, and, possibly, the *Tarauni* of the Urartians, see also E. Honigmann, *Die Ostgrenze des byzantinischen Reiches (Corpus Bruxellense* 3 [Brussels 1935]) 147-151, 198-204, maps I, IV; Lap'anc'yan, *Xajasa* 184; Weissbach, in *RE* 4 A/2.2329-2330.

The imperial Chinese origin of the Mamikonids is asserted by Faustus, 5.4, 37, Sebēos, 2, and by Ps. Moses, 2.81, the latter two indicating that the title borne by their imperial ancestors was *čen-bakur*. The first element of that title is the ethnicon 'Chinese,' the second, a rendering of the Iranian *bağpūr*, itself a translation of the Chinese imperial title of *l'ien-tzu* ('Son of Heaven'); Markwart, *Streifzüge* 133-134; *Südarmerien* 77\*-78\* (he thought, however, that it was the King of the Kushans, who also entitled himself 'Son of Heaven' [*devaputra*], and not the Emperor of China who was meant here); Justi, *Namenbuch* 240. Actually, the Georgian origin of the Mamikonids seems more likely. In the first place, they were dynasts of the Georgian, or proto-Caucasian and half-Georgian, Tayk'; in the second, there are philological data to support it. The basic element of their *nomen gentilicium* and most likely their gentilitial title, *mamik* or *mamak*, is a composite of the Armenian diminutive suffix *-ik/-ak* and of the Georgian word *mama* or 'father'; Adontz, *Armenija* 402-403, 405. Also, the *praenomen* 'Mušel,' found among them, is a Georgian territorial epithet, formed with the addition of the Georgian suffix *-el* (Armenianized as *-eł*) to the name of the chief city of Tarawn, Muš; Adontz, *op. cit.* 398; Markwart, *Südarmerien* 157 n.1. Adontz explained the Chinese tradition by a confusion, prompted by a love of exotic origins, between the ethnicon *čen* and that of the Georgian Čan-ians (Tzanni) or Lazi (for whom, see *supra* nn. 27, 28; Gugushvili, *Division* 56, 64), who were settled in the neighbourhood of Tayk'.

It cannot be called in question that this region was originally Georgian — or at least proto-Caucasian and consequently pre-Armenian but also pre-Georgian — and that, prior to the Artaxiad acquisition of it at any rate, it was within the Iberian sphere. Its reigning house, it has just been seen, was most likely of Georgian extraction. But, having admitted this, it is also necessary to admit that, following its inclusion in the Armenian realm, it remained within the political (and no doubt also largely cultural) sphere of Armenia for many centuries to come. This has been recently denied by a distinguished Soviet Georgian scholar, Ĵanašia, e.g., in 'Ob odnom primere iskaženija istoričeskoj pravdy,' *Vorposy Istorii* 5 (1947); but we should have been deprived of the pleasure of reading him on this subject, had he remembered at least this: that the Mamikonids of Tayk'-Tao were one of the greatest houses of the Armenian Monarchy and that the Artaxiads annexed not only *παρώρεια τοῦ Παρνάδρου* but also the land of Klarjet'i, lying north of it; cf. my *Vitaxae* V. To be sure, both lands ultimately returned to Georgia, but Tao considerably later than Klarjet'i. In the course of the nearly endless turmoil that followed the setting up of the Caliph's control in Armenia, the Mamikonids lost all of their possessions, save only a south-western fraction of Tarawn and the near-by land of Sasun, where they survived, reduced in importance, the reversal of fortune, while Tarawn itself and Bagrewand passed to the Bagratids; Laurent, *Arménie* 92-94; Adontz, 'Les Taronites en Arménie et à Byzance,' *Byzantion* 10 (1935) 545-551 (this ought to serve as a correction of Markwart's genealogical construction in *Südarmerien* 517-530); Grousset, *Histoire* 318-319, 320-321, 331-332. For their role in the Eastern Empire, see Adontz, 'L'âge et l'origine de l'empereur Basile I<sup>er</sup>,' *Byzantion* 9 (1934) 242-243, 259, where the possibility of the Mamikonid origin of the Basilids and of the family of the Empress Theodora (Theophilus' wife) is indicated.

The great office-fief of the Mamikonid house was that of High Constable of Armenia = *sparapet* or *asparapet*. The term, like the Georgian *spaspet* (*supra* at n. 105), was derived from the Old Pers. \**spadapaitiš*; the office was the equivalent of the Sassanian offices of *Ērān-spāhbaδ* and (if it existed as a separate office) of *aspabaδ*, as well as of the High Constable of Iberia; cf. my *Orontids* II. Unlike *spaspet*, it had no civil functions, which were entrusted to the *hazarapet* (cf. *supra* at n. 195). The Gk. Life of St. Gregory 98 (72-73) and its Arabic parallel 86 (in Garitte's translation, *Documents* 72) give a succinct account of the powers of this office: *ὁ τῶν Μαμακουνιανῶν ἡγεμὼν, ἀσπαραπέτης, πάντας τῶν Ἀρμενίων ἱππότας τε καὶ πεζοὺς ἔχων ὑπὸ τὴν οἰκείαν στρατηγίαν, συνῶν τε αἰὲ τῇ βασιλεῖ τῆς Μεγάλης Ἀρμενίας, καὶ ἐν ταῖς παρατάξεσιν πάντας τοὺς τε προηγουμένους καὶ ὑποταττομένους < ... > ὑπὸ τὴν οἰκείαν στρατηγίαν* = 'princeps mqwny'nwn nomine 'šb'r'b'ts: hic autem praefectus erat exercitui totius Armeniae, equitum et peditum, nec discedebat a rege magnae Armeniae, atque in bellis omnes quos memoravimus principes, et memorabimus, sub eius potestate erant, praeterquam quod princeps qmrđl [Corduene; Garitte, *Documents* 219-220] non erat sub eius potestate, quae (regio) est iuxta fortes qrdytn.' (For this exceptional position of the Prince of Corduene, see my *Vitaxae* § 14.) Elsewhere in the Gk. Life, 172(103), the *sparapet* is called τοῦ μεγάλου στρατηγοῦ καὶ ἀσπαραπέτου. The Gk. Agath. 135 has for it: *στρατοπεδάρχης στρατηλατικῆς ἐξουσίας*. In the biblical translations, it is made to correspond to the *ἀρχιστράτηγος* of Gen. 21.22, 23 (= the Georg. [eris-]mł'avar).

For *Μαγκαῖος*, the earliest recorded Mamikonid, see my *Orontids* II 12. It is possible that this Greek name merely reproduced the gentilitial title. The Gre-



gorid inheritance will be discussed in a later study. — The Mamikonids play the most prominent part in the narratives of Faustus, Lazarus, Eliseus and Zenobius, but are outshone by the Bagratids in Sebēos. Ps. Moses, who is inimical to them (cf. Adontz, *Armenija* 267; Akinian, in RE Suppl. 6. 536, 537), does all in his power to minimize their position and historical role. The documents of the Gregorian cycle give the *praenomen* of the then prince: Artawazd, 'Αρτάβα<σ>δος; Arm. Agath. 124/860 (ed. Tiflis 1914, 434); Gk. Life of St. Gregory 124 (83); Arab. Life 112(83), 163(105).

*Note F (cf. n. 224 supra)*

LEONTIUS OF RUISI ON THE NINE DUCHIES

Leont. Mrov. 24-25:

მაშინ ფარნავაზ... განაწესნა ერისთავნი რვანი და სპასპეტი. ერთი გაგზავნა მარგვს ერისთავად, და მისცა მცირით მთითგან, რომელ არს ლიხი, ვიდრე ზღურადმდე ეგრისისა, რიონს ზემოდ. და ამანვე ფარნავაზ ალაშქრნა ორნი ციხენი, მორაპანი და დიმნა. და გაგზავნა მეორე კახეთისა ერისთავად, და მისცა არაგვთგან ვიდრე ჭერეთამდე, რომელ არს კახეთი და კუხეთი. მესამე გაგზავნა ზუნანისა ერისთავად, და მისცა ბერდუჯის მდინარითგან ვიდრე ტფილისამდე და გაჩიანთამდის, რომელ არს გარდაბანი. მეოთხე გაგზავნა სამშვლდის ერისთავად, და მისცა სკვრეთისა მდინარითგან ვიდრე მთამდე, რომელ არს ტაშირი და აბოცი. მეხუთე გაგზავნა წუნდის ერისთავად, და მისცა ფანავრითგან ვიდრე თავადმდე მტკვრისა, რომელ არს ჯავახეთი და კოლა და არტანი. მეექვსე გაგზავნა ოძრგის ერისთავად, და მისცა ტახისკართგან ვიდრე არსიანთამდის, ნოცტის თავითგან ზღუამდის, რომელ არს სამცხე და აჭარა. მეშვიდე გაგზავნა კლარჯეთის ერისთავად, და მისცა არსიანითგან ზღუამდე. და მერვე, ქუჯი, იყო ერისთავი ეგრისისა. ხოლო ერთი დაადგინა სპასპეტად და მისცა ტფილისითგან და არაგვთგან ვიდრე ტახისკარამდე და ფანავრადმდე, რომელ არს შიდა - ქართლი.

'Then P'arnavaz ... set up eight dukes and a High Constable. One he sent to be duke over Margvi [= Margvet'i], and have him [territory] from the little mountain, which is Lixi, to the Sea of Egrisi [= Black Sea] above the Phasis — and [there] P'arnavaz built two castles, Šorapani and Dimna; he sent the second to be duke over Kaxet'i, and gave him from the Aragvi to Heret'i, which is Kaxet'i and Kuxet'i; the third he sent to be duke over Xunani, and gave him from Berduji River to Tiflis and to Gač'iani, which is Gardabani; the fourth he sent to be duke over Samšwilde, and gave him from Skwret'i River to the mountain [of Armenia], which is Taširi and Aboc'i; the fifth he sent to be duke over Cunda, and gave him from [lake] P'anavari to the sources of the Cyrus, which is Javaxet'i and Kola and Artani; the sixth he sent to be duke over Ojrxē, and gave him from Tasiskari [= T'rialet'i] to [the] Arsiani [mountains], from the source of the Noste to the sea, which is Samc'xe and Ačara; the seventh he sent



to be duke over Klarjet'i, and gave him from Arsiani to the sea; and the eighth, Kuji, was Duke of Egrisi. But one he sent to be High Constable and gave him from Tiflis and the Aragvi to Tasiskari and P'anavari, which is Inner Iberia.'

This text does not make it clear that the High Constable held a dukedom, but the existence in Iberian history of a 'Duke of Iberia (K'art'li), i.e., of Inner Iberia, shows clearly that the appanage of the High Constable was in effect a duchy; cf. Brosset, *Hist. Gé.* I/1 (St. Petersburg 1849) 41 n.2 (thus, the historian Vaxušt speaks of nine dukes). For these toponyms, see Javaxišvili, *K'art' er. ist.* II 278-281, 283-310, 319-331; Gugushvili, *Division* 56-57, 59-64, 65-67.

*Georgetown University.*



